DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 457 392 CE 082 436

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Kogan, Deborah; Dickinson, Katherine P.; Fedrau, Ruth; Midling, Michael J.; Wolff, Kristin E. |
| TITLE | Creating Workforce Development Systems That Work: An Evaluation of the Initial One-Stop Implementation Experience. Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Social Policy Research Associates, Menlo Park, CA. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, DC. |
| PUB DATE | 1997-08-15 |
| NOTE | 318p.; For Appendices and Practitioner's Guide, see CE 082 437-438. Some "Exhibits" in document are missing. |
| CONTRACT | F-4957-5-00-80-30 |
| AVAILABLE FROM | For full text: http://usworkforce.org/onestop/eval.htm. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative (142) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC13 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Adult Education; Agency Cooperation; Cooperative Programs; Coordination; Delivery Systems; *Economically Disadvantaged; Employment Programs; *Employment Services; Facility Planning; Federal Programs; Federal State Relationship; Financial Support; Governance; Information Systems; Institutional Cooperation; *Job Training; *Labor Force Development; Marketing; Needs Assessment; Organizational Objectives; Program Evaluation; *Program Implementation; Staff Development; *State Programs; Welfare Recipients; Welfare Services |
| IDENTIFIERS | Infrastructure; *One Stop Centers |

ABSTRACT

This report analyzes progress states and local sites have made in implementing the One-Stop Career Center systems. An executive summary is followed by Section A, Introduction, which provides an overview of the One-Stop initiative and describes evaluation objectives and methods. The main portion of the report is organized into three major sections. Section B, on state and local organization and governance, has two chapters that address overall system development and the creation of the One-Stop systems. Section C, on development of the infrastructure to support the One-Stop systems, includes six chapters that examine the ways that states and local sites have developed sub-systems to support their One-Stop centers, such as physical facilities, information systems, staff capacity-building systems, financing agreements, marketing strategies, and performance measurement systems. Section D, on service design and delivery, is comprised of two chapters on services designed for individual and employer customers. Each chapter in Sections A-C consists of an introduction and description of different approaches the states used to further the 3-7 goals listed in each chapter. Section E reviews progress-to-date in meeting the objectives of the initiative, including the progress in meeting these four federal themes: universal access, customer choice, integrated services, and system accountability driven by customer outcomes and continuous improvement efforts. (YLB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 457 392

**SPR**

SOCIAL POLICY RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

# Creating Workforce Development Systems That Work:

## An Evaluation of the Initial One-Stop Implementation Experience

Final Report
August 15, 1997

Prepared by:

Deborah Kogan, Project Director
Katherine P. Dickinson
Ruth Fedrau
Michael J. Midling
Kristin E. Wolff

Submitted to:

Dick Ensor, Government Officer's Technical Representative
U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
One-Stop Team
Room N-4700
200 Constitution Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20210

DOL Contract No. F-4957-5-00-80-30
Task Orders #1, #3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

200 Middlefield Road, Suite 100, Menlo Park, CA 94025
Phone (650) 617-8625/Fax (650) 617-8630

CE082436

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# PREFACE

This report has been prepared by Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) to document the process undertaken by the first nine One-Stop implementation states—and local areas within those states—in planning and implementing One-Stop systems to realize the overall program goals of (1) universal access, (2) customer choice, (3) integration of services, and (4) accountability for customer satisfaction and participant outcomes.

Two companion volumes may be of interest to the reader. A separately bound Appendix to this report consists of individual One-Stop Profiles of the experiences of the 9 states and 14 local areas included in the study. A Practitioners' Guide, scheduled for completion in September 1997, focuses on the challenges in developing customer-oriented services in a One-Stop environment and provides detailed examples of the different strategies case-study sites have used to address these challenges. Each of these documents is expected to be available in electronic form on the USDOL Technology Training Resource Center (TTRC) Web site at http://www.ttrc.doleta.gov.

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the states and local One-Stop systems and centers that participated in the study. They endured our nearly endless questions, provided useful information, and shared their enthusiasm about the transformations underway in their workforce development systems as well as their frustrations with the difficulties they encountered along the way. We would also like to thank those One-Stop employers and individual customers who participated in on-site focus groups that provided us with information about the customer's perspective on the changes underway.

We also would like to thank the members of the One-Stop Team within the U.S. Department of Labor, whose members in both the national and regional DOL offices have been extremely helpful in supporting and guiding this research effort. Particular thanks are due to Norm Lance and Dick Ensor for their assistance as Government Technical Representatives on this effort. We would also like to express our thanks and appreciation to Maria Remboulis, who was a key member of the SPR project team during its first year.

## CONTENTS

**Executive Summary** .......... ES-1

**SECTION A. INTRODUCTION**

Overview of One-Stop Initiative .......... A-1
Evaluation Objectives and Methods .......... A-2
Overview of Final Report .......... A-8

**SECTION B. ORGANIZING AND GOVERNING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS**

**Chapter 1. Guiding One-Stop System Development: The State Role** .......... 1-1
Introduction .......... 1-2
Goals for Guiding One-Stop System Development .......... 1-2
Goal 1. Building Effective State Partnerships To Guide One-Stop System Development .......... 1-3
Goal 2. Creating State-Level Structures to Govern and Manage One-Stop Systems .......... 1-10
Goal 3. Guiding the Development of Local One-Stop Systems and Centers .......... 1-15
Goal 4. Promoting Coordination of One-Stop System-Building Efforts among State and Local Partners .......... 1-35
Analysis of Accomplishments in Guiding Local One-Stop System Development .......... 1-38

**Chapter 2. Building Local Partnerships and Governing One-Stop Systems** .......... 2-1
Introduction .......... 2-1
Goals for One-Stop Organization and Governance .......... 2-1
Goal 1. Building Effective Local Partnerships .......... 2-1
Goal 2. Organizing One-Stop Centers into Local Systems .......... 2-17
Goal 3. Forming Effective Governance Structures for One-Stop Centers .......... 2-28
Goal 4. Staffing One-Stop Centers to Facilitate Service Coordination .......... 2-38
Accomplishments and Next Steps .......... 2-44

## SECTION C. BUILDING THE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

**Chapter 3. Developing Appropriate Physical Facilities for One-Stop Operations** .......... 3-1

- Introduction .......... 3-1
- Goals of Creating Appropriate Physical Facilities .......... 3-1
- Goal 1. Providing State Support for the Development of Appropriate Facilities .......... 3-1
- Goal 2. Accommodating the Co-Location of One-Stop Partners .......... 3-3
- Goal 3. Designing Facilities that Support Integrated Staffing and Service Provision .......... 3-6
- Goal 4. Designing Facilities that Are Professional, Attractive, and "User-Friendly" .......... 3-8
- Goal 5. Designing Centers that Are Accessible to Customers with Special Needs .......... 3-9
- Accomplishments, Challenges, and Next Steps .......... 3-10

**Chapter 4. Creating an Effective One-Stop Information Infrastructure** .......... 4-1

- Introduction .......... 4-1
- Goals for Developing a Shared Technology and Information Infrastructure .......... 4-2
- Goal 1. Improving Communication Among One-Stop Partners .......... 4-2
- Goal 2. Providing User-Friendly Access to Information for Customers .......... 4-6
- Goal 3. Supporting the Delivery of Coordinated and Consolidated Services to One-Stop Customers .......... 4-11
- Goal 4. Supporting Shared Accountability for One-Stop System Accomplishments .......... 4-16
- Accomplishments in Developing a Supportive Technology and Information Infrastructure .......... 4-19

**Chapter 5. Building Staff Capacity** .......... 5-1

- Introduction .......... 5-1
- Goals of Capacity Building Efforts .......... 5-1
- Goal 1. Coordinating the Capacity Building Roles Played by Different One-Stop Partners .......... 5-2
- Goal 2. Preparing One-Stop Staff to Work Together in a High-Performance Workplace .......... 5-6
- Goal 3. Cross-Training One-Stop Staff to Carry Out Broad Functions .......... 5-9
- Goal 4. Preparing Staff to Provide Integrated One-Stop Services .......... 5-12

Goal 5. Training Managers and Technical Support Staff in New Skills Needed in the One-Stop Setting ........ 5-14

Analysis of Capacity Building Accomplishments, Challenges, and Next Steps ........ 5-15

**Chapter 6. Financing One-Stop Services** ........ 6-1

Introduction ........ 6-1

Goals of Financing One-Stop Services and Allocating Costs ........ 6-1

Goal 1. Coordinating Efforts by State and Local Partners to Finance One-Stop Services ........ 6-2

Goal 2. Developing Cost-Sharing Arrangements that Blend Resources from Multiple Funding Streams ........ 6-5

Goal 3. Using One-Stop Implementation Grant Funds as a Catalyst ........ 6-13

Goal 4. Identifying Additional Financial Resources To Support Universal Core Services ........ 6-19

Analysis of Funding and Cost Allocation Accomplishments ........ 6-24

**Chapter 7. Marketing One-Stop Systems** ........ 7-1

Introduction ........ 7-1

Goals of Marketing Efforts ........ 7-1

Goal 1. Coordinating the Marketing Roles Played by Different One-Stop Partners ........ 7-2

Goal 2. Promoting the One-Stop Vision among Internal One-Stop Partners ........ 7-3

Goal 3. Marketing the Overall One-Stop System to External Customers ........ 7-5

Goal 4. Marketing Specific One-Stop Services and Products ........ 7-7

Goal 5. Reaching Out to an Expanded Customer Base ........ 7-9

Goal 6. Linking One-Stop Marketing Efforts to Promotional Efforts for Related Workforce Development Initiatives ........ 7-15

Analysis of Marketing Accomplishments ........ 7-18

**Chapter 8. Measuring One-Stop Performance and Planning for System Improvements** ........ 8-1

Introduction ........ 8-1

Goal 1. Defining Performance Measures for the One-Stop System ........ 8-1

Goal 2. Implementing One-Stop Performance Measurement ........ 8-3

Goal 3. Using Performance Measures for Program Improvement ........ 8-7

Accomplishments, Challenges, and Next Steps ........ 8-9

## SECTION D. DESIGNING AND DELIVERING ONE-STOP SERVICES

**Chapter 9. One-Stop Services for Individual Customers** .......... 9-1
Introduction .......... 9-1
Goals for Transforming Services for Individual Customers .......... 9-1
Goal 1. Simplifying Access to Services .......... 9-2
Goal 2. Providing a Wide Range of Services to Meet the Diverse Needs of Customers .......... 9-4
Goal 3. Making Effective Self-Access Services Available to All Customers .......... 9-6
Goal 4. Providing Guided Services to Customers Needing Assistance in Choosing Careers and Finding Employment .......... 9-17
Goal 5. Providing More Intensive Training and Supportive Services .......... 9-24
Goal 6. Providing Targeted Populations with Specialized Services .......... 9-27
Goal 7. Making Services Convenient to Access .......... 9-34
Accomplishments in Providing Services to Individual Customers .......... 9-41

**Chapter 10. One-Stop Services for Employers** .......... 10-1
Introduction .......... 10-1
Goals For Transforming Employer Services .......... 10-2
Goal 1. Redefining The Employer As A Core Customer of The Workforce Development System .......... 10-3
Goal 2. Providing Simplified Access to an Integrated Menu of Employer Services .......... 10-7
Goal 3. Linking Employers to High-Quality Information Related to Their Needs and Interests .......... 10-12
Goal 4. Improving the Quality of Labor Exchange Services to Better Meet Employer Hiring Needs .......... 10-17
Goal 5. Offering Enhanced Employer Services .......... 10-21
Analysis of Accomplishments in Developing Employer Services .......... 10-24

## SECTION E. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction .......... E-1
Universal Access .......... E-2
Customer Choice .......... E-5
Integrated Services .......... E-6
System Accountability Driven by Customer Outcomes and Continuous Improvement Efforts .......... E-10

Factors Influencing One-Stop Implementation and Accomplishments .......... E-10
Recommendations .......... E-12

**Appendices: State and Local One-Stop Profiles**
Note: Appendices are Bound as a Separate Volume to This Report

Appendix A: State of Connecticut .......... A-1
Appendix B: Connecticut Works Career Center, New London, Connecticut .......... B-1
Appendix C: Connecticut Works Career Center, Willimantic, Connecticut .......... C-1
Appendix D: State of Indiana .......... D-1
Appendix E: Eastside Center, Indianapolis Network for Employment and Training, Indianapolis, Indiana .......... E-1
Appendix F: Workforce Development Center, Lawrenceburg, Indiana .......... F-1
Appendix G: State of Iowa .......... G-1
Appendix H: Workforce Development Center, Creston, Iowa .......... H-1
Appendix I: Workforce Development Center, Des Moines, Iowa .......... I-1
Appendix J: State of Maryland .......... J-1
Appendix K: Eastside Career Center, Baltimore, Maryland .......... K-1
Appendix L: Columbia Employment & Training Center, Columbia, Maryland .......... L-1
Appendix M: State of Massachusetts .......... M-1
Appendix N: FutureWorks Career Center, Springfield, Massachusetts .......... N-1
Appendix O: State of Minnesota .......... O-1
Appendix P: Minnesota Workforce Center - Anoka County, Blaine, Minnesota .......... P-1
Appendix Q: State of Ohio .......... Q-1
Appendix R: Wood County Employment Resource Center, Bowling Green, Ohio .......... R-1
Appendix S: State of Texas .......... S-1
Appendix T: Arlington Career Center, Arlington, Texas .......... T-1
Appendix U: Lake Jackson Career Center, Lake Jackson, Texas .......... U-1
Appendix V: State of Wisconsin .......... V-1
Appendix W: Waukesha County Workforce Development Center, Pewaukee, Wisconsin .......... W-1

# EXHIBITS

Exhibit A-1 Key Features of Local Sites Included in the One-Stop Evaluation ........ A-4

Exhibit 1-1 State Agencies Involved in One-Stop Planning ........ 1-4

Exhibit 1-2 Examples of Interagency Committees Formed to Support One-Stop Development ........ 1-7

Exhibit 1-3 State One-Stop Policy Boards ........ 1-12

Exhibit 1-4 State System-Building Goals ........ 1-17

Exhibit 1-5 State Guidelines on Local One-Stop Partnerships ........ 1-19

Exhibit 1-6 State Guidelines for Local One-Stop Governance and Day-to-Day Center Management ........ 1-24

Exhibit 1-7 Examples of State Guidelines for Universal Services for Job-Seekers ........ 1-28

Exhibit 1-8 Examples of State Guidelines for Service for Employers ........ 1-31

Exhibit 1-9 State Guidelines on Service Integration ........ 1-33

Exhibit 1-10 Examples of State Coordination Efforts ........ 1-36

Exhibit 2-1 Examples of Initiating One-Stop Partnerships ........ 2-3

Exhibit 2-2 Local Agencies Involved in One-Stop Planning and Service Delivery ........ 2-7

Exhibit 2-3 Examples of the Breadth of Local One-Stop Partnerships ........ 2-8

Exhibit 2-4 Integrating One-Stop with School-to-Work and Welfare-to-Work Systems ........ 2-14

Exhibit 2-5 Examples of Organizing One-Stop Service Delivery Systems: Networks, Centers, Satellites ........ 2-19

Exhibit 2-6 On-Site Partners and Programs ........ 2-24

Exhibit 2-7 Examples of On-Site and Off-Site Service Partners ........ 2-26

Exhibit 2-8 Examples of Policy Bodies ........ 2-30

Exhibit 2-9 Examples of One-Stop Center Management Structures ........ 2-33

Exhibit 2-10 Examples of Operations Teams ........ 2-37

Exhibit 2-11 Approaches to the Integration of One-Stop Services ........ 2-39

Exhibit 2-12 Examples of Staffing One-Stop Centers ........ 2-42

Exhibit 4-1 Examples of Approaches to Facilitate Communication Among One-Stop Partners ........ 4-3
Exhibit 4-2 Examples of Making Automated Services Available Through Multiple Modes ........ 4-8
Exhibit 4-3 Examples of How Information Technology is used to Support Coordinated Service Delivery ........ 4-13
Exhibit 4-4 Examples of How Technology Supports Shared Accountability for System Outcomes ........ 4-17
Exhibit 5-1 Case Study Examples of States with Well-Developed Capacity Building Roles ........ 5-4
Exhibit 5-2 Case Study Examples of Training that Emphasizes Customer Orientation and High Performance Workplace Skills ........ 5-7
Exhibit 5-3 Case Study Examples of Cross-Training One-Stop Staff to Carry Out Broad Functions ........ 5-11
Exhibit 5-4 Case Study Examples of Training to Support the Delivery of Integrated One-Stop Services ........ 5-13
Exhibit 6-1 Case Study Examples of Allocating Shared Facilities and Equipment Costs ........ 6-6
Exhibit 6-2 Investment of One-Stop Implementation Grant Funds in State-Level Projects ........ 6-15
Exhibit 6-3 Case Study Examples of How Local One-Stop Implementation Grants were Used ........ 6-17
Exhibit 7-1 Examples of Marketing Roles Played by State One-Stop Partners ........ 7-4
Exhibit 7-2 Examples of Internal Marketing Approaches ........ 7-6
Exhibit 7-3 Examples of Marketing the Overall One-Stop System to External Customers ........ 7-8
Exhibit 7-4 Examples of Marketing Specific Customer Services and Products ........ 7-10
Exhibit 7-5 Examples of Activities Designed to Reach Out to an Expanded Employer Customer Base ........ 7-12
Exhibit 7-6 Examples of Activities Designed to Reach Out to an Expanded Individual Customer Base ........ 7-16
Exhibit 7-7 Examples of Efforts to Link One-Stop marketing Efforts with Promotional Efforts by Related Workforce Development Initiatives ........ 7-17

Exhibit 8-1 Summary of Planned Performance Measures in Case Study States ........ 8-4
Exhibit 8-2 Examples of Planned Measures in Case Study States ........ 8-5
Exhibit 9-1 Examples of Self-Access Services ........ 9-8
Exhibit 9-2 Examples of More Intensive Assessment and Career Counseling ........ 9-19
Exhibit 9-3 Examples of Group Workshops ........ 9-21
Exhibit 9-4 Examples of Enhanced Job-Search Support ........ 9-23
Exhibit 9-5 Examples of Training Services ........ 9-25
Exhibit 9-6 Examples of Specialized Services to Targeted Populations ........ 9-28
Exhibit 9-7 Examples of Making Services Geographically Accessible ........ 9-35
Exhibit 9-8 Examples of Extended Service Hours ........ 9-38
Exhibit 9-9 Examples of Remote Access to Electronic One-Stop Services ........ 9-39
Exhibit 10-1 Examples of Providing Employers with High-Quality Information ........ 10-14
Exhibit 10-2 Examples of Enhanced Employer Services ........ 10-22

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
# FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, funded Social Policy Research Associates (SPR) to evaluate state and local One-Stop systems in the first nine states that received One-Stop implementation grants. The *Evaluation of the Initial One-Stop Implementation Experience* had the following objectives:

- To document the progress of the initial nine implementation states in planning One-Stop systems and developing policies to support the implementation of these systems.
- To document the implementation of local One-Stop centers operating in a wide range of environments.
- To identify key factors that have facilitated or impeded state and local One-Stop systems in their ability to meet the federal One-Stop themes of universal access, customer choice, service integration, and accountability for customer outcomes.

## KEY FINDINGS

### Accomplishments in Implementing State and Local One-Stop Systems

1. State and local One-Stop system-building efforts are being driven by a shared federal–state vision that emphasizes the importance of (a) meeting customer needs, (b) offering high-quality, user-friendly information tools, (c) treating both job-seekers and employers as important customers of the public workforce development system, and (d) coordinating customer services across different programs and funding streams.
2. The early stages of One-Stop service redesign have led to significant changes in the services provided to employers and job seekers. Both employer and job-seeker customers are enthusiastic in describing One-Stop career centers as improvements over the previously uncoordinated system.
3. The transformation of workforce development services from separate and discrete categorical programs into coherent seamless systems is occurring through an evolutionary process.
    - Early One-Stop implementation efforts in most sites emphasized forming partnerships, developing shared physical facilities and

shared decision-making processes, and developing integrated front-end services, such as intake, orientation, and preliminary eligibility assessment.

- Much progress has already been made in creating high-quality universal One-Stop services.
- However, many states and local sites are still relatively early in the process of consolidating enhanced services for job-seekers and employers.

### Factors That Have Influenced One-Stop System Implementation

4. Factors that appear to have facilitated the development of effective One-Stop partnerships and the achievement of system transformation goals include the following:

   - A strong history of collaboration among local workforce development programs prior to the One-Stop initiative.
   - A state One-Stop design that provides clear guidelines for local One-Stop systems but also allows local One-Stop partners substantial discretion to tailor One-Stop systems to local needs.
   - Continued active involvement over time by a broad range of state and local planning partners in ongoing planning and oversight of the evolving One-Stop system.
   - The involvement of direct service staff from participating agencies in the planning of shared facilities and consolidated services over an extended planning period (e.g. 6 months to a year) prior to opening the One-Stop center.
   - Formal planning linkages between the One-Stop initiative and school-to-work and welfare-to-work systems at both the state and local level.
   - An attractive, accessible physical facility that supports both a flexible customer flow and frequent interaction among staff of partnering agencies.
   - The ability of One-Stop staff from different agencies to exchange relevant information and communicate via electronic mail on a regular basis.
   - Careful attention to the capacity building needs of One-Stop managers and local staff to help prepare them to deliver integrated customer services.

5. The development of integrated One-Stop systems is also occurring in the face of significant barriers in a number of sites. These barriers include the following:

   - The absence of a federal legislative mandate for the development of integrated state workforce development systems. The fact that workforce development block grants were not approved by the 104th Congress removed a key source of federal policy support for the integration of One-Stop services by states. It also removed an expected source of financing for integrated services.
   - The resulting continuation of federal categorical funding streams, each with its own mandated targeted population, eligibility criteria, reporting requirements, and performance standards.
   - Concerns about how to ensure that individuals from groups with special needs will have access to the services they need. Each of the categorical programs has its dedicated constituency concerned about the needs of a targeted population group. For example, key constituencies are concerned about how veterans, individuals with disabilities, at-risk youth, welfare recipients, non-English speakers, and other special groups will fare in a system that is not designed around special programs for each of these groups.
   - Concerns about the job security of the workers in the various agencies currently responsible for administering each of the categorical programs.
   - Declining overall public investments in workforce development programs and services. A number of respondents indicated their concern that they were being asked to "do more with less." If overall resources continue to decline, even an integrated workforce development system will find it difficult to deliver high quality services to a diverse customer base.

   These factors, although they make One-Stop implementation more difficult, need not prevent the creation of successful integrated workforce development delivery systems. Indeed, the continuation of categorical programs helps to ensure that One-Stop systems will arrive at an appropriate balance between attending to the needs of the general public and those of subgroups facing special employment barriers and possessing distinctive service needs.

### Progress in Furthering the Goal of Universal Access

6. One of the most significant accomplishments in furthering the goal of universal access has been the development of high-quality "self-access" information services, which are available to all individual and employer customers. Self-access services expand and enrich the services available to the general public and have been well-received by a number of One-Stop customers, including individuals who have not previously used public workforce development services.
7. Additionally, a number of sites have improved service accessibility by (a) extending the hours of center operation and (b) making automated information services available to customers from a number of different locations, including remote access from home and business computers equipped with modems.
8. In the absence of federal legislation providing additional funding for universal services (e.g., through state workforce development block grants), most states and local sites have been able to offer only limited staffed or guided One-Stop services to the general public beyond the services traditionally provided by the ES and UI programs (e.g., application for UI benefits, access to job listings, and referral to jobs in response to job listings posted by local employers). A few sites have attempted to make more intensive services available based on individual customer needs and interests rather than categorical program eligibility.

### Progress in Furthering the Goal of Customer Choice

9. One-Stop sites have expanded customer choice by providing high-quality information about labor markets and available service options.
10. Within a given One-Stop center, customers are generally given a choice among several different modes of service delivery, such as self-access information services, group workshops, individual counseling sessions, and more intensive education and training supports. More staff-intensive services are often reserved for customers eligible for specific categorical programs, such as welfare-to-work programs, JTPA-funded programs, and vocational rehabilitation programs.
11. Many One-Stop centers have also expanded customer choice by offering a large number of brief workshops and training sessions covering different aspects of career decision making, resume development, job search, and skills needed for career advancement. Customers are able to choose between attending individual or sequenced sessions.
12. Most local One-Stop systems offer customers the option of receiving services from several different One-Stop centers within the same service area. In some systems, local centers are encouraged to tailor

their offerings to meet the needs of local customer groups and to increase overall customer choice within the local system.

**Progress in Furthering the Goal of Integrated Services**

13. Initial efforts to increase service integration sometimes caused organizational strains within and between One-Stop partner agencies about how to coordinate or consolidate services across staff from agencies with different ways of doing things and different "agency cultures."

14. As a result of formal One-Stop partnerships, a number of sites have consolidated outreach, orientation, and intake services. Fully integrated intake was not usually achieved during the early stages of One-Stop implementation because of the difficulties associated with (a) conforming the information and reporting requirements for different programs and (b) creating consolidated information systems.

15. All case study sites identified an integrated system of employer services as a high priority goal, but few had completed their redesign of employer services during the first year of One-Stop implementation. Improved employer services under consideration or development in most sites included

    - improved job and resume listing services, including services integrated with America's Job Bank and America's Talent Bank.
    - improved software to match applicants and jobs,
    - development of a number of enhanced services available to employers on a fee-for-service basis, including services to assess and train incumbent workers and assist with large-scale hiring efforts, and
    - integrated or coordinated systems of employer account representatives to coordinate and broker services for individual employer customers.

16. In a number of sites, policy makers and managers appear to be facing a critical decision point: whether and how to proceed with further integration of enhanced job-seeker services. Concerns include (1) how to ensure that One-Stop services will remain responsive to the widely varying needs of One-Stop customers from various subgroups, (2) how to prepare partnering agencies and staff to take on different responsibilities in an integrated service delivery setting, and (3) how to prioritize the needs of different customers.

**Progress in Furthering Accountability for Customer Outcomes**

17. Most states and local areas made significant progress during the initial stages of One-Stop implementation in developing an overall menu of

One-Stop performance measures for future use. They also began collecting information on customer satisfaction and other measures that can be used to assess system-wide performance over time.

18. At the local level, some One-Stop centers began to use information on customer outcomes and satisfaction to support system-wide improvement efforts.

19. States and local areas had different opinions about whether One-Stop performance measures should ultimately supplement, subsume, or replace the performance measures currently in existence for individual categorical programs. A number of states are waiting for additional federal guidance on One-Stop performance measurement issues from the national workforce development performance measures policy group.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Federal, state, and local policy-makers could support efforts by local workforce development systems to further the One-Stop goals of universality, customer choice, integration, and accountability for customer outcomes by pursuing the following objectives.

1. Develop a number of different approaches that could be used by local One-Stop systems to finance the delivery of integrated One-Stop services.
    - Support the development of alternative cost-allocation practices.
    - Work to increase the flexibility of program regulations so that a number of different funding streams can be combined (preserving the eligibility requirements associated with each funding stream) to support the delivery of integrated One-Stop services to both customers eligible for targeted services and the general public.
    - Identify additional funding sources, including user fees, that can support the development and delivery of first tier (self-access) and second tier (guided or group) services to a broad range of One-Stop customers.
2. Work toward improved collaboration among workforce development agencies and programs at the federal and state level, including, but not limited to, programs funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
    - Continue to work to develop consensus about standardized workforce development reporting and performance measures on an interagency basis at the federal level.

   - Encourage collaborative linkages between welfare-to-work, school-to-work, and One-Stop implementation efforts at all levels.
   - Address legislative and regulatory barriers to integrating service delivery across all workforce development programs, including vocational rehabilitation and veterans employment services.

3. Support the development of federal, state, and local interagency collaborative service approaches to meet the needs of individuals with "special needs," such as welfare recipients, individuals with disabilities, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, and veterans.
4. Plan for on-going investments to update and maintain over time the automated self-service information products and the information infrastructure that supports them.

# SECTION A
# INTRODUCTION

# A. INTRODUCTION

## OVERVIEW OF THE ONE-STOP INITIATIVE

The U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) has undertaken an initiative to promote the transformation of workforce development services into a system of One-Stop Career Centers. The overall objective of the One-Stop initiative is to unify the "patchwork" of categorical programs into a single workforce development system. Specific objectives of the federal One-Stop initiative include the following:

- *Universal access*: The design and delivery of core workforce development services universally accessible to all individual and employer customers, regardless of their eligibility for specific categorical programs.
- *Customer choice*: The transformation of the bureaucratic maze of categorical workforce development programs into a customer-driven system that allows job-seeker and employer customers to select services and service-delivery modes appropriate to their individual needs and interests.
- *Service integration*: The integration of the planning, design, and delivery of services across multiple funding streams and agencies to create a system of services that is seamless from perspective of the customer.
- *Outcome accountability*: The development of new system-level accountability mechanisms, including measures of customer satisfaction, to ensure that the system is driven by efforts to improve outcomes for worker and employer customers.

Although experimentation with One-Stop models has been underway in some states and local areas for over a decade, DOL promoted widespread One-Stop planning and implementation of these systems by awarding a series of One-Stop planning and development and implementation grants to states. By the end of Fiscal Year 1995, the U.S. Department of Labor had awarded 3-year implementation grants to 16 states, 18-month grants for the development of local One-Stop Learning Laboratories to 10 local areas (some of which were within states that also received implementation grants), and 12-month planning and development grants to 27 states to support the creation of interagency partnerships and plans for One-Stop career center systems.

The One-Stop Career Center initiative is continuing to expand, both within existing implementation states—as local partnerships start up additional One-Stop career centers and make self-access services available to home and business users through remote dial-in or Internet access—and through the designation of new implementation states. In January 1997, DOL announced that another 17 states would receive One-Stop implementation grants by July 1997, bringing the total number of implementation states to 33. When fully operational, One-Stop career centers in these 33 states are expected to serve 80% of the nation's civilian labor force. In addition, activities designed to further the goals of the One-Stop initiative have been undertaken even among the 21 states and territories that have not yet received formal One-Stop implementation assistance from the federal government.

To receive One-Stop implementation funds, states and local sites must demonstrate that their new systems will include the state and local agencies responsible for the following Department of Labor programs: (1) the Employment Service; (2) Unemployment Insurance; (3) federal employment and training programs for economically disadvantaged youth and adults under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) Title II; (4) dislocated worker services, including services funded under JTPA Title III; (5) the Senior Community Service Employment Program funded under Title V of the Older Americans Act; and (6) Veterans Employment and Training Services (VETS), including separate funding streams for all veterans and disabled veterans.

In addition, the Department of Labor encourages states and local areas to involve a wide variety of additional workforce development and human services agencies in the coordinated planning and consolidated delivery of services. Examples of these additional partners include vocational rehabilitation and other programs for individuals with disabilities; adult basic education and literacy programs; secondary and post-secondary vocational education programs; welfare-to-work programs targeted to recipients of time-limited cash assistance for families with dependent children (TANF), Food Stamps, and state-funded general relief; and economic development agencies.

## EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

DOL funded Social Policy Research Associates to evaluate the state and local One-Stop systems in the first nine states that received One-Stop implementation grants. The Evaluation of the One-Stop Career Center System had three major objectives:

- Assessing the progress of the initial nine implementation states in planning One-Stop systems and developing policies to support the implementation of these systems.
- Assessing the implementation of local One-Stop centers operating in a wide range of environments.
- Identifying the key factors that have facilitated or impeded efforts by emerging One-Stop systems to meet the four federal objectives as well as the individual objectives of state and local areas.

To accomplish these evaluation objectives, we developed a qualitative evaluation that included extensive site visits to collect information about One-Stop planning, design, implementation, and preliminary outcomes in the 9 states receiving first-round implementation funds and in 14 local sites within those states.

Exhibit A-1 summarizes the key features of the local sites that were included in our sample. We selected two local sites in five states, and one local site in each of the remaining four states. The sample was chosen to represent One-Stop systems that were operating in varying local contexts. For example, we selected four sites located in rural areas, four in urban areas, four in suburban areas, and two in urban or suburban areas that drew customers from surrounding rural areas as well. The sites were also selected to represent a variety of potential organizational models: eight sites represented consortia between numerous partner agencies; four sites represented joint leadership between two partner agencies, and two sites represented other organizational arrangements.

### State-Level Data Collection and Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative data on state One-Stop designs, planning process, early implementation experiences, and preliminary outcomes were collected through intensive site visits to the nine states receiving first-round implementation grants. During these state-level site visits, we conducted structured discussions with a wide range of respondents responsible for policy guidance, administration, and implementation of the One-Stop initiative in their states. We also spoke with

Exhibit A-1 (page A-4)

Exhibit A-2 (page A-5)

representatives from public agencies or organizations not participating in the One-Stop initiative.

Guided by written protocols developed for a variety of state-level respondents, we explored the state role in developing and overseeing One-Stop implementation across the nine implementation states. Among the key research questions we examined during the state-level site visits were the following:

- What do the organizational structures and state and local governance arrangements look like in each state, and how do these vary across the initial nine states?
- What types of information infrastructures have states developed to support One-Stop implementation? How do these vary across states? How have states addressed the challenge of integrating or sharing client-level information across workforce development partners? How have they addressed cost-sharing?
- How do the service designs vary across each of the nine implementation states? Have states mandated core services to be provided in all One-Stop Centers? What are these services? Which states have taken the lead in developing automated products designed to support service delivery? Which have supported the local sites in securing products that best meet the service needs of their local customers?
- How have states integrated the four federal themes—universality, customer choice, integration, and accountability—into their designs? How have they supported the efforts of local sites to address these issues?
- What have been the key challenges in One-Stop implementation? How have states addressed these challenges?

These visits were supplemented by reviews of written materials including state One-Stop implementation plans, quarterly progress reports submitted to DOL, materials developed to support various aspects of One-Stop system building, and preliminary information on customer satisfaction and outcomes. Using the results of our data collection, we prepared case-study narrative profiles for each of the nine One-Stop states we visited.

### Local-Level Data Collection and Analysis

Qualitative and quantitative data on local One-Stop designs, planning, and implementation were also collected through intensive site visits to the 14 local sites in our sample. During the local-level site visits, we conducted in-depth discussions with key individuals involved in the local planning and implementation of the One-Stop initiative, as well as staff from agencies or community-based organizations not participating in the local One-Stop system. Respondents included local managers and administrators responsible for implementing various aspects of system change linked to the One-Stop initiative, staff responsible for providing One-Stop services to individual and employer customers, and staff of various partner agencies coordinating their services with the local One-Stop centers or operating parallel initiatives such as school-to-work or welfare reform.

In addition, we held discussions with diverse groups of One-Stop Center customers, both employers and individuals, to learn about their experiences with the new workforce development systems in their areas. These focus groups included customers who had used public sector employment and training programs to access services prior to One-Stop implementation, as well as customers who were new to the system.

Among the key questions we examined during these visits to local One-Stop Centers were the following:

- Who are the *partner agencies and programs* represented at the One-Stop Centers and what are their respective roles? When and how were these relationships established? Is there a local governing body responsible for oversight of local One-Stop system building?
- What types of *management or information infrastructures* have local sites developed for sharing information across partner programs and agencies represented in One-Stop centers? Have local sites developed cost-sharing agreements?
- How has the *local service design* evolved and how have services and delivery systems changed as a result? How have One-Stop partners used automated systems and improved technology to improve services to customers? How have local sites attracted new customers?
- How have local One-Stop centers integrated the *four federal themes*—universality, integration, customer choice, and accountability—into their local designs? How have states influenced the operationalization of these themes?
- What have been the *key challenges in One-Stop implementation*? How have local sites addressed these challenges?

These discussions, in addition to the written materials we collected at each local site, were used in the development of local-level profiles that describe the implementation experiences of the 14 local case study sites.

## OVERVIEW OF FINAL REPORT

This report presents our analysis of the progress that states and local sites have made in implementing their One-Stop Career Center systems. This report is organized into three major sections:

- *State and local organization and governance.* This section includes two chapters that address overall system development and the creation of effective state and local One-Stop partnerships.
- *Development of the infrastructure to support One-Stop systems.* This section includes six chapters that examine the ways that states and local sites have developed sub-systems to support their One-Stop centers. These sub-systems include physical facilities, information systems, staff capacity-building systems, financing agreements, marketing strategies, and performance measurement systems.
- *Service design and delivery.* This section includes two chapters on services designed for individual and employer customers.

The conclusion reviews progress made to date in meeting the objectives of the U.S. Department of Labor's One-Stop Career Center Initiative, including the progress in meeting the four federal themes, and discusses current challenges and next steps in enhancing One-Stop services and delivery systems nationwide.

A separately bound Appendix to the Final Report includes the state and local profiles describing the One-Stop implementation experiences of each of the 9 state and 14 local study sites.

In addition to the Final Report, which is intended primarily for workforce development policy-makers, planners and program administrators, we are also developing a separately bound *Practitioners' Guide,* which is intended for the expanding community of One-Stop practitioners who provide services to customers. This guide will focus on the challenges in developing customer-oriented services in a One-Stop environment and provide detailed examples of the different strategies case-study sites have used to address these challenges.

# SECTION B
# ORGANIZING AND GOVERNING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

# 1. GUIDING ONE-STOP SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT: THE STATE ROLE

## INTRODUCTION

The One-Stop initiative depends on the inter-related and simultaneous transformation of workforce development systems at the federal, state, and local levels. Each level of government involved in this system-change initiative must exhibit leadership, the ability to innovate, and a willingness to compromise if the initiative is to succeed in transforming the workforce development services available to individuals and firms into seamless customer-driven services.

In the nine first-round One-Stop Implementation Grant states, states took on leadership roles to guide three aspects of system development. To guide the organizational development of One-Stop state and local systems, the study states undertook the following:

- Negotiated agreements from relevant state and local agencies to join together in implementing One-Stop systems.
- Developed state-level governance structures for One-Stop efforts, which included identifying entities responsible for policy guidance and day-to-day administration of One-Stop system development.
- Developed guidelines for local One-Stop systems to follow in developing their own governance and management structures.

The study states often used activities including the following to guide the development of the infrastructure needed to support One-Stop operations:

- Prepared automated user-friendly information products for self-service use by business and individual customers within One-Stop systems.
- Designed and developed the information technology needed to support the delivery of information products to customers and the exchange of information among One-Stop agency partners.
- Designed performance measurement systems to assess system accomplishments and guide system improvements.

To guide the development of One-Stop services, the study states in most cases:

- Generated and disseminated a common state vision of how One-Stop systems should be organized, how services should be transformed, and how One-Stop centers should fit together into statewide systems.
- Developed guidelines for local One-Stop systems to follow in developing their own One-Stop designs and implementation plans.
- Promoted communication and coordination among state and local One-Stop partners during the system-building process, which included brainstorming possible solutions to implementation difficulties and sharing best practices.

In this chapter, we review these leadership activities as they relate to states' efforts to guide the organizational development of One-Stop systems and the design and delivery of One-Stop services. The roles states played in guiding and developing the various sub-systems needed to support One-Stop operations—including physical facilities, information systems, capacity building efforts, financing, marketing, and performance assessment systems—are discussed within the chapters (3 through 8) describing each of these sub-systems individually.

### GOALS FOR GUIDING ONE-STOP SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

Overall state goals for promoting the organizational development of One-Stop systems and guiding the design and delivery of One-Stop services included the following:

1. Building effective state partnerships involving all of the important stakeholders in One-Stop system planning and implementation.
2. Creating state-level structures to govern and manage One-Stop system development.
3. Guiding the development of local One-Stop systems and centers.
4. Promoting communication about and coordination of One-Stop system-building efforts among state and local partners.

Although states' overall goals for guiding One-Stop systems were generally similar, the strategies each state used to develop state partnerships, govern One-Stop systems, guide local One-Stop system development, and coordinate activities among One-Stop partners varied substantially. Below, we describe the different approaches the states used to further each of these goals.

## GOAL 1. BUILDING EFFECTIVE STATE PARTNERSHIPS TO GUIDE ONE-STOP SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

As described in Exhibit 1-1, the study states all involved a wide range of state agencies in planning their One-Stop systems. In each state, these One-Stop planning partners included the agencies, divisions, or offices responsible for the six mandated DOL-funded programs—Employment Services (ES), Unemployment Insurance (UI), Veterans Employment and Training Services (VETS), Older Worker programs funded under Title V of the Older Americans Act, and programs administered under Titles II and III of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). Each of the study states also included the state agencies responsible for adult basic education, vocational rehabilitation, income maintenance, and welfare-to-work programs. In addition, most states included the state agencies responsible for overseeing the state post-secondary education system (particularly community and technical colleges), elementary and secondary education, and business and economic development.

In developing state-level One-Stop partnerships and guiding local partnership formation, the study states used several different approaches to involve a wide range of workforce development programs and services. One common organizational strategy was to build state interagency work groups to promote collaboration by different state and local agencies in One-Stop planning and oversight. Another organizational strategy—undertaken by some of the study states prior to receiving the One-Stop implementation grant and by others after receiving the grant—was to consolidate authority for multiple workforce development programs within a single state agency or designate a single state agency as the lead agency for the One-Stop initiative.

### Developing Structures to Promote Interagency Collaboration

Most of the first-round implementation grant states began by developing work groups to promote interagency discussion about the design of One-Stop systems. In many states, these work groups were designed to involve middle- and upper-level managers of the relevant state agencies in frank and informal discussions about how they could collaborate to improve customer services. Interagency work groups or planning teams were usually distinguished from the formal policy boards with official responsibility for overseeing state workforce development policy. In contrast to the formal policy boards, they were established to do the "real work" of inventing a new workforce development service approach and delivery system that would minimize

## Exhibit 1-1
## State Agencies Involved in One-Stop Planning

| | CT | IN | IA | MD | MA[1] | MN | OH | TX | WI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Number of State Agency Planning Partners[2]** | **5** | **6** | **6/3** | **6** | **7** | **5** | **7** | **7/1** | **8/7** |
| **Agency Responsible for Program/Service:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment Services/Unemployment Insurance | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Job Training Partnership Act, Title II | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| JTPA Title III and other programs for dislocated workers | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Community or Technical College System | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| K-12 Education System | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Vocational Education | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

---

[1] State agencies were originally involved in planning task forces in Massachusetts. However, state agencies are no longer involved in day-to-day planning or oversight, because of interagency tensions, although they have agreed to provide funds to support career center operations through Interagency Service Agreements with the MassJobs Council.

[2] Where there are two numbers, the first number is the number of state agency partners involved prior to consolidation of responsibilities for workforce development programs; the second number is the number of state agency partners involved after agency consolidation.

**Exhibit 1-1** (Continued)

| **Agencies Responsible for Program/Service** | **CT** | **IN** | **IA** | **MD** | **MA** | **MN** | **OH** | **TX** | **WI** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Income Maintenance and Welfare-to-Work programs | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Economic Development | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Adult Basic Education | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| **Additional Partners:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vocational Education | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Department of Aging/Elder Affairs |  |  | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |
| Department of Mental Health |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |
| Department of Corrections |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |
| Veterans Affairs |  |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓ |
| Community Service |  |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |

duplication of effort by customers or across partner agencies and encourage the emergence of integrated workforce development services at the local service delivery level.

Exhibit 1-2 describes the interagency work groups that evolved in selected case study states. Often, these groups included representatives from both state-level and local-level One-Stop partner agencies, an arrangement based on the understanding that some workforce development and education programs (such as ES and U I) have a strong tradition of state administration, while others (such as JTPA and primary and secondary education programs) have a strong tradition of local control. In most states, One-Stop interagency work groups were broad in scope and involved the agencies responsible for each of the recommended programs listed above.

Interagency work groups were used by all the study states during the early stages of One-Stop planning. In addition to overseeing system development as a whole, these work groups often formed subcommittees or task groups to take responsibility for developing state One-Stop strategies for particular aspects of system development, such as marketing, capacity-building, designing self-service options, and developing consolidated information systems. Although their participatory decision-making process sometimes made it difficult for these groups to make decisions quickly, interagency work groups succeeded in giving a large number of agencies a voice in state-level One-Stop planning.

In a number of states, interagency work groups continued to function as One-Stop executive committees during the first year of One-Stop implementation. Other states found that interagency structures were either less workable or less necessary during One-Stop implementation. For example, in Massachusetts, the emergence of the MassJobs Council as the lead One-Stop administrator—responsible for convincing existing public agencies to transfer funds and program responsibilities to newly chartered career center operators—made continuing dialogue between the state agencies previously responsible for One-Stop programs and the council difficult to maintain. In both Iowa and Texas, the creation of a new consolidated workforce development agency during the early stages of One-Stop implementation also changed the dynamics of interagency collaboration. In these states, there was a shift over time from interagency collaboration to internal management of the One-Stop initiative by the new lead One-Stop agency, as further described below.

### Exhibit 1-2
### Examples of Interagency Committees Formed to Support One-Stop Development

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | An Interagency Statewide Planning Committee has assumed the lead in implementing statewide One-Stop implementation policy. With representation from both state agencies and local workforce development boards, this committee includes the state agencies responsible for ES/UI/JTPA, welfare/vocational rehabilitation, K-12 education, higher education, and economic and community development. |
| Iowa | During One-Stop planning efforts, an interagency Workforce Development Management Team included representation from all state partner agencies including the agencies responsible for JTPA, ES and UI, welfare, education/vocational rehabilitation, and others.<br>Since the creation of a consolidated workforce development agency responsible for ES/UI/JTPA, the remaining independent state-level partners have had a harder time collaborating as equals with the "lead" Workforce Development Department on One-Stop planning issues. |
| Indiana | An informal One-Stop Advisory Council oversees the details of One-Stop implementation. The council includes representatives of the SHRIC and representatives of state and local workforce development agencies, including the state agencies responsible for ES/UI/JTPA/workforce literacy/vocational and technical education, welfare/vocational rehabilitation, commerce, and education. Additional members include representatives of the community college system, labor unions, the state chamber of commerce, and employers. |
| Massachusetts | During the early stages of One-Stop planning, seven interagency work groups promoted participation in One-Stop planning by a variety of state agency representatives. However, during the first implementation year, several interagency committees made up of high-level staff from participating agencies tried to maintain ongoing coordination linkages but failed. |

**Exhibit 1-2** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Maryland | The CareerNet Steering Committee is made up of representatives of key state and local partner agencies. State agencies represented include the agencies responsible for ES/UI/JTPA, welfare, K-12 education/school to work/vocational rehabilitation, higher education, and business and economic development. |
| Minnesota | A Workforce Center System Issues Team includes key state and local workforce center partners. This group met twice a month during the first implementation year to address implementation issues. |
| Ohio | A One-Stop Governance Council with representation from all participating state agencies and departments oversees hands-on planning and development of the One-Stop system. Members of the Governance Council lead individual interagency work teams on specific implementation issues. |

### Consolidating Workforce Development Authority

Consolidating authority for multiple workforce development programs within a single state agency was another approach used to facilitate collaboration across programs. Prior to receiving One-Stop implementation grants, a number of the first-round One-Stop states had already consolidated the state-level administration of the Employment Services and Unemployment Insurance programs as part of an effort to achieve integration of services for these two programs at the local level. In addition, six of the nine first-round One-Stop states (Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Ohio, and Wisconsin) already administered the ES, UI, and JTPA programs from within the same state agency.

In response to the One-Stop goal of promoting coordinated planning and service delivery across multiple workforce development programs, four of the nine case study states undertook further consolidation of state workforce development agencies. Organizational reforms in Iowa and Indiana simplified administrative responsibilities for a number of different programs. In Iowa, the formation of the new Department of Workforce Development in July 1996 brought together DOL-funded programs that had been housed previously in three different agencies. Progressive agency consolidation efforts in Indiana also resulted in the formation of a consolidated Workforce Development Department responsible for a broad set of programs. By 1994, Indiana's Workforce Development Department was responsible for JTPA, ES, UI, workforce literacy, vocational and technical education, workforce proficiency standards and the state occupational information coordinating council.

Even more ambitious consolidation efforts were undertaken in Texas and Wisconsin, where the resulting consolidated agencies were responsible for welfare-to-work programs as well as other workforce development programs. A major state reorganization in Wisconsin in July, 1996, merged the agency previously responsible for ES, UI, JTPA, and the school-to-work initiative with the state welfare agency, previously responsible for income maintenance, welfare-to-work programs, and vocational rehabilitation. In June 1996, Texas consolidated the responsibility for workforce development programs previously administered by seven different state agencies within the new Texas Workforce Commission. Among the key programs included were ES, UI, JTPA, Job Corps, literacy programs, welfare-to-work programs, adult education, apprenticeship training, post-secondary vocational and technical training, and school-to-work planning. States that consolidated responsibility for a broad range of workforce development programs within a single agency hoped that this new arrangement would make it easier to develop unified information systems, intake procedures, service delivery designs, and reporting and accountability systems across these programs. Although this goal was achieved by most states, the mere fact of agency consolidation did not automatically result in the development of a unified agency philosophy, staff, or program regulations. Such unification required continued discussions and negotiations among the members of the new management team of the consolidated agency.

The states that created consolidated agencies with responsibility for welfare-to-work as well as other workforce development programs faced perhaps the most dramatic challenge—that of creating a culture and policies for the new consolidated agency that would simultaneously further both welfare reform and One-Stop customer service objectives. Finding a way to weave together the "work first" philosophy of many state welfare-reform initiatives and the "customer-driven" philosophy guiding the One-Stop initiative was not a simple task, even where both initiatives were housed within a single agency.

In the long run, agency consolidation may very well be a sound strategy for furthering the goal of increased collaboration across programs. However, in the short run, consolidation efforts appeared to divert several One-Stop implementation states from the immediate task of guiding local One-Stop system development, particularly in states that underwent major governmental reorganizations. Because these states needed time to develop an integrated state-level management structure and policy framework for the new consolidated agency, they were less able than other One-Stop states to respond to requests for guidance from local One-Stop implementation sites during the initial months of local One-Stop implementation.

### GOAL 2. CREATING STATE-LEVEL STRUCTURES TO GOVERN AND MANAGE ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

Each of the study states developed several different types of One-Stop governance and management structures. These structures were designed to (1) provide policy direction, (2) oversee the planning phase and develop the detailed design of different aspects of the state's One-Stop system, and (3) provide day-to-day support to and oversight of local One-Stop system development.

### Providing Overall Policy Guidance

To guide and oversee the development of One-Stop workforce development systems, each of the study states developed one or more policy boards. Exhibit 1-3 describes the policy boards responsible for guiding One-Stop system building in the different case study states.

In four states—Massachusetts, Minnesota, Texas, and Wisconsin—a single policy board, designated as the official state human resources investment council (SHRIC), is responsible for providing policy oversight of One-Stop system development as part of its mandate to guide all human resources and workforce development issues. In these states, the SHRICs provide detailed oversight of One-Stop system building, which includes designating service delivery area boundaries, developing criteria for certification of local career centers, and determining which centers and local boards are ready for certification.

Some other states, including Indiana, Iowa, Maryland, and Ohio, have found it helpful to have two policy bodies with different levels of responsibility. These states have developed a two-tiered system of policy guidance for the development of integrated workforce development systems. The first tier consists of the SHRIC or another board mandated to provide broad policy guidance on welfare-to-work, school-to-work, and workforce development topics. These broad policy boards often played a key role in developing the early vision and framework for the state's One-Stop system. The second tier is a more narrowly focused policy body with the responsibility for overseeing the details of One-Stop implementation. The second-tier entities providing detailed One-Stop policy guidance consist variously of a formal state Workforce Development Council (in Iowa), a standing subcommittee of the full SHRIC (in Ohio); a One-Stop advisory council that makes recommendations to the SHRIC (in Indiana); and a designated state lead agency, which shares its policy oversight role with the SHRIC (in Maryland).

### Coordinating One-Stop System Planning and Implementation

Across all states, One-Stop interagency task groups or subcommittees have taken on responsibility for developing detailed plans for the different aspects of One-Stop design and implementation. These task groups have been assigned a number of different planning tasks, including addressing issues of state and local governance and accountability for One-Stop systems, developing state-level criteria or blueprints for guiding local One-Stop service design and delivery, and guiding and developing the

## Exhibit 1-3
## State One-Stop Policy Boards

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | The Connecticut Employment and Training Commission is the policy board designated by the state legislature in 1994 to oversee the development of a statewide system of Job Centers focused on the delivery of workforce development services to the general public.<br>However, the informal Interagency Statewide Planning Committee has assumed the lead role in overseeing the implementation of statewide One-Stop policy. |
| Iowa | The Council on Human Investment was established in 1993 to provide global policy for welfare reform, economic development, and workforce development.<br>The Iowa Workforce Development Council, created by executive order in 1994 and formalized by the state legislature in 1996, is responsible for guiding the development of local interagency workforce development centers. |
| Indiana | Indiana has three levels of policy support: (1) The Indiana Policy Council supports interagency and cross-program collaboration by removing barriers between agencies; (2) the State Human Resources Investment Council, formed in 1993, addresses human investment and welfare reform issues and oversees individual workforce development programs; and (3) a One-Stop Advisory Council oversees the administration of the DOL One-Stop Implementation Grant and provides non-binding policy recommendations to One-Stop partners. |
| Massachusetts | The MassJobs Council, designated as the official state human resources investment council in 1993, is responsible for overseeing state workforce development programs. |
| Maryland | The Governor's Workforce Investment Board, established in 1993 as the state human resources investment council, is the original initiator of the statewide One-Stop approach. Day-to-day administration of the One-Stop initiative has now shifted to the Department of Labor, Licensing, and Regulation. |
| Minnesota | The Governor's Workforce Development Council was established as the state human resources investment council in 1995. |

**Exhibit 1-3** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | The Governor's Human Resources Investment Council was established in 1993 to coordinate economic development, education, and human resource investment services.<br>A One-Stop Standing Committee of the council deals with the details of One-Stop system development. |
| Texas | The State Council of Workforce and Economic Competitiveness was created in 1993. The council is responsible for making overall recommendations to the governor about school-to-work and welfare-to-work initiatives, as well as identifying local workforce development areas, developing criteria for certifying local workforce development boards, and approving local board plans. |
| Wisconsin | Initially, a State Human Resource Investment Council was established in December 1994 with oversight over all workforce development programs. This was superseded in 1996 by a smaller Council on Workforce Excellence. |

infrastructure needed to support One-Stop operations. In most cases, a number of different task groups have been formed to consider different aspects of each general task. For example, to plan for One-Stop services, most states have convened different task groups on such topics as integrated intake, job-entry assistance, career exploration assistance, uniform assessment, remote access, and employer services. To ensure that the recommendations developed by these groups address concerns of partners at both the state and local level, states have often encouraged participation in task groups by both state and local agency representatives.

Interagency task groups have played different roles during the different stages of One-Stop planning and implementation. In a number of states, interagency task groups began by meeting weekly or bi-weekly during the initial planning stages. Interagency task groups often prepared concept papers proposing state One-Stop policies as they completed their initial planning tasks. After a work group had completed its initial plan, the group's recommendations were usually circulated to other task groups (so that different task groups could coordinate their efforts), to the rest of the One-Stop practitioner community for discussion, and to the state One-Stop governing board for policy action. Some states have continued to use interagency task groups during the first and second years of One-Stop implementation, by reformulating task group assignments and membership as implementation issues have arisen. During the implementation phase, interagency task group meetings have in some cases declined in frequency.

### Supporting and Overseeing Local System Development

Once One-Stop policies were approved by the appropriate state-level policy board, the responsibility for managing state One-Stop implementation and supporting and overseeing local One-Stop system development was usually delegated to a state One-Stop project management team housed within a designated lead agency. In most of the study states, the designated lead agency is the agency responsible for the ES, UI, and JTPA programs. In some states—such as Connecticut, Indiana, and Maryland—the agency responsible for the mandatory DOL-funded programs was somewhat narrowly focused on these programs. As a result, the One-Stop initiative in these states took on the identity of a "labor department" initiative, even though a number of other partners had participated in One-Stop system planning. In other states—such as Minnesota—it was emphasized that the ongoing responsibility for One-Stop system implementation was shared equally by the agencies responsible for workforce development, education, vocational training, and welfare programs, even though a single lead agency had been designated to manage the One-Stop implementation grant.

The individuals assigned to the One-Stop project teams within the lead agency were often recruited from a number of different state agency partners and carefully selected so that several key skills were represented, including (1) familiarity with and enthusiasm about the goal of integrated workforce development services; (2) expertise in a number of the particular implementation issues facing state and local areas (e.g., interagency collaboration, service design, financing, technology, and information system development); and (3) a commitment to state–local collaboration in the system building process.

Several states referred to the staff members of the state One-Stop project team as "brokering agents" for the system as a whole; as such, they helped support partnership building at the state and local level and share information and resources as necessary to keep the overall state One-Stop system building effort on track. Staff within state One-Stop project offices usually described their role as leading, guiding, and supporting local One-Stop implementation efforts—as well as learning from staff in well-developed local systems—rather than as monitoring or auditing local implementation efforts. Specific responsibilities commonly assigned to the members of state One-Stop project teams included the following:

- Coordinating the activities of the different interagency work groups, task groups, and policy boards involved in One-Stop planning and management.
- Serving as the hub for collecting and disseminating information about One-Stop implementation, which included facilitating communication among state partners, between state and local partners, and among local partners.
- Promulgating state guidelines for the formation of local One-Stop policy boards, and the certification of local One-Stop systems and centers.
- Providing technical assistance to local One-Stop implementation sites.

### GOAL 3. GUIDING THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL ONE-STOP SYSTEMS AND CENTERS

In their One-Stop implementation grant applications to the U.S. Department of Labor, states described their plans for building statewide One-Stop systems. As summarized in Exhibit 1-4, policy makers often described the appropriate state role as providing a coherent vision and guidelines within which local areas could develop specific One-Stop partnerships and designs suited to local conditions. However, the balance between state guidance and local discretion varied widely from state to state. Three of the first-round implementation grant states—Connecticut, Indiana, and Maryland—planned for direct state-level participation in developing and overseeing each One-Stop career center. Five states—Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Ohio, and Texas—planned to delegate much of the responsibility for local One-Stop system design and oversight to regional workforce development policy boards. These states envisioned that regional policy boards would assume the responsibility for issues such as specifying how many local One-Stop centers would be established, determining who the local One-Stop partner agencies would be (within parameters established by the state), and, in some states, selecting the entities that would provide One-Stop services locally. Wisconsin, the remaining state, gave substantial discretion to local collaborative planning teams in the early stages of One-Stop planning, but at the time of the site visits had not yet established a formal local governance structure to counter-balance state administration of the ongoing One-Stop system.

In the remainder of this section, we describe how the states varied in the guidelines they developed to influence local One-Stop system development. We briefly address the states' roles in guiding the following aspects of One-Stop system development: (1) the development of local One-Stop partnerships, (2) the governance and day-to-day management of local One-Stop systems and individual centers, and (3) the design and delivery of One-Stop services.

### Guiding the Development of Local One-Stop Partnerships

Exhibit 1-5 summarizes the guidelines developed by different states regarding the inclusion of different agencies within local One-Stop partnerships. Some of the study states identified the agencies that were required to participate in the development of local One-Stop plans; other states identified the programs that were required to be accessible to customers through local One-Stop centers.

All states required, at a minimum, involvement of the agencies responsible for Employment Services, Unemployment Insurance, Veterans Employment and Training Services, programs funded under Titles II and III of the Job Training Partnership Act, and Older Worker programs under Title V of the Older Americans Act. States required that these agencies be involved in One-Stop planning and that all full-service One-Stop

## Exhibit 1-4
## State System-Building Goals

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Connecticut's goal is to establish 19 *Connecticut Works* centers jointly administered by the Connecticut Department of Labor and 9 Regional Workforce Development Boards. Centers will provide a full range of DOL-funded services through co-location and the integration of services among center partners. |
| Indiana | Indiana's goal is to establish 26 full-service One-Stop career centers distributed throughout the 16 state planning units, so that every Indiana resident will be within 50 miles of a One-Stop center. Planning, oversight, and evaluation of One-Stop centers will be shared by the Indiana Department of Workforce Development and local policy boards. Full-service centers will be supplemented with additional staffed, unstaffed, and remote access points to automated One-Stop services. |
| Iowa | Iowa wants to promote development of at least one One-Stop center in each of Iowa's 16 service delivery areas. The state role is to provide state leadership and encourage local ownership. Detailed designs for local systems are initiated at the local level, in response to criteria established by the state. Local policy boards will ultimately be able to designate One-Stop service providers. |
| Massachusetts | Each of Massachusetts' 16 workforce development regions is expected to have at least two competing career centers after the One-Stop transformation is completed. Local One-Stop systems are designed by Regional Employment Boards following state guidelines. The goal is a "centrally-guided, locally-driven" system. |
| Maryland | Maryland is planning to establish a statewide network consisting of at least 50 staffed One-Stop career centers distributed across its 12 service delivery areas, supplemented by unstaffed career information centers and remote access opportunities. The state provides local areas with automated core One-Stop services and the technology to support them. Local areas may add enhanced services, additional components, and compatible technology. |
| Minnesota | Minnesota is planning to establish 50 Minnesota Workforce Centers across its 17 workforce service areas. The state goal is to provide state guidance and support local implementation by establishing minimum criteria for certification of local One-Stop centers. |

**Exhibit 1-4** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | Ohio's initial goal was to establish at least one One-Stop center in each of its 30 service delivery areas. Rather than encouraging a standardized approach, the state encourages the development of multiple models for local One-Stop systems. Full-time co-location of local system partners is not required. |
| Texas | Texas hoped to have at least one One-Stop center in each of its 28 workforce development areas by the end of 1996. The goal is to guide the development of locally-driven One-Stop systems. Certified local workforce development boards have substantial discretion over the service delivery design and providers used within their local service areas. |
| Wisconsin | Wisconsin is planning an extended network of 62 Job Centers statewide. The state has developed a general blueprint for what a local Job Center should look like in the form of Job Center standards. Each service delivery area is encouraged to develop at least two full-service centers in addition to additional staffed and self-service sites. |

### Exhibit 1-5
### State Guidelines on Local One-Stop Partnerships

**Key:**

**✓ = Required Local Partner or Program**
**+ = Recommended Local Partner**

| | CT | IN | IA | MD | MA | MN | OH | TX | WI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employment Services/Unemployment Insurance | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Veterans Employment and Training Services | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Job Training Partnership Act, Title II | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| JTPA Title III and other programs for dislocated workers | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Older worker programs under the Older Americans Act | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Community or technical college system | + | | + | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Vocational Rehabilitation and/or Services for the Blind | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | + | | ✓ |
| Income maintenance and/or welfare-to-work programs | + | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Adult basic education | + | | + | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

**Exhibit 1-5** (Continued)

**Key:**
✓ = **Required Local Partner or Program**
+ = **Recommended Local Partner**

| | **CT** | **IN** | **IA** | **MD** | **MA** | **MN** | **OH** | **TX** | **WI** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Vocational education | | | + | | | | ✓ | | ✓ |
| USDOL-approved apprenticeships | + | ✓ | | | | | | | |
| School-to-work programs | | | + | | | + | + | ✓ | |
| Migrant/seasonal farmworker programs under Title IV, JTPA | | | + | | + | ✓ | | | |
| Indian and Native American programs under Title IV, JTPA | | | + | | | ✓ | | | |
| Homeless programs under McKinney Act | | | + | | | ✓ | | | |
| Community Action programs | | | | | | + | | | |
| Programs for displaced homemakers under Carl Perkins Act | + | | | | | + | | | |

centers provide information abut the eligibility requirements and services from each of these agencies and arrange for appropriate referrals to "make these services accessible to" all One-Stop customers.[1] As described below, however, there was substantial variation in whether states required the co-location of all mandatory One-Stop partners within One-Stop centers.

States' requirements concerning the participation of non-DOL-funded program partners were less uniform. There was variability in both which agencies were required or encouraged to be included as local One-Stop partners and which were required or encouraged to be located on-site to deliver services to customers at One-Stop centers. Most states either specified or recommended some additional partners. Ohio developed a more complicated scheme, with a second tier of four "optional" partners (at least three of which had to be included in each local system) plus a third tier of "recommended" partners.[2]

Seven of the nine case study states required local areas to include the agency responsible for welfare-to-work programs as a local One-Stop partner.[3] However the passage of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 has introduced uncertainty in many states as to how income maintenance and workforce development agencies will share the responsibility for helping families move from welfare to work and what role One-Stop centers will play in that process. Among the study states, Texas and Wisconsin—the two states in which the One-Stop lead agency is also responsible for administering welfare-to-work services—have arranged for the One-Stop system to be used as the primary delivery system for welfare-to-work services. A similar commitment has apparently been secured in Connecticut, even though the welfare agency was not previously a required local One-Stop partner.

---

[1] The one exception occurred in Massachusetts, which could not arrange for JTPA Title II funds to be allocated to chartered One-Stop career center operators during the first two years of One-Stop implementation, because these funds had already been used to contract with JTPA service providers not associated with the career centers. However career center operators were required to make referral arrangements to provide career center clients access to JTPA services.

[2] In Exhibit 1-4, we have listed Ohio's "optional" partners as required, since three of the four partners must be included in each local One-Stop system.

[3] In Texas, One-Stop centers were required to include the DOL-funded partners at the outset. At the end of the first year of One-Stop operation, they were required to have developed a plan for also incorporating welfare-to-work, adult basic education, and school-to-work programs within local One-Stop centers.

Four of the study states—Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, and Minnesota—required local One-Stop systems to include the agencies responsible for vocational rehabilitation services as planning partners. Rather than requiring co-location of staff providing vocational rehabilitation services at One-Stop facilities, most states require only that centers ensure that One-Stop customers will "have access to" vocational rehabilitation services. Minnesota, however, calls for the co-location of vocational rehabilitation staff within One-Stop centers and the integration of rehabilitation services with all other required One-Stop services.

Three case study states—Maryland, Ohio, and Wisconsin—call for community or technical college systems to be included in the One-Stop planning process and ongoing local One-Stop partnerships. These states view such institutions as valuable partners not only in providing enhanced education and training services to individual students but also in offering customized training to One-Stop business customers. Iowa also expects community colleges to play an important role in planning and providing One-Stop services in many local areas.

Smaller numbers of states require or recommend participation by additional agencies. Three case study states—Minnesota, Texas, and Wisconsin—call for adult basic education agencies to be included as One-Stop planning and service delivery partners. Two states—Ohio and Wisconsin—require the agencies responsible for secondary and post-secondary vocational education programs to be involved in One-Stop planning. One state (Texas) requires that local One-Stop systems include as a planning partner the policy group responsible for the local school-to-work initiative and plan for the integration of school-to-work and One-Stop services within One-Stop career centers. Three other states highly recommend participation by school-to-work agencies in local One-Stop planning and service delivery.

As described in the next chapter, local areas have developed dramatically different partnerships in response to these different guidelines. Some local areas have included only the required partners; others have taken advantage of the discretion permitted local One-Stop systems to add additional partners beyond the required agencies. As a result, the number of local One-Stop partners across the 14 local sites included in the evaluation varied from two primary agency partners (usually the two agencies responsible for ES/UI/VETS and JTPA) to more than ten active local agency partners.

### Guiding the Governance and Day-to-Day Management of Local One-Stop Systems and Centers

In developing guidelines for the governance of local One-Stop systems, states have tried to ensure that local One-Stop policy boards have broad representation of One-Stop partner agencies and other stakeholders, including employers, educational institutions, and local elected officials. As described in Exhibit 1-6, two different strategies emerged among the study states.

Four states—including Indiana, Maryland, Minnesota, and Ohio—created flexible guidelines for the establishment of local One-Stop policy boards. Three of these states let local areas modify and expand local JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) as needed to ensure that all local One-Stop stakeholders were represented. The fourth state (Maryland) called for the creation of a new informal One-Stop planning and management team with a minimum of five members representing the PIC chair, the Employment Service manager, the JTPA staff director for the local service delivery area, and one additional employer. In several of these states, local policy boards were cautioned to separate their JTPA administrative responsibilities from their role in guiding One-Stop system planning and oversight, although they were not prohibited from continuing to provide JTPA services directly.

Another four states—Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts, and Texas—required local areas to develop new formal policy boards responsible for the design and implementation of integrated workforce development services. In Connecticut and Massachusetts, regional employment and training policy boards with a relatively broad mandate were already in existence prior to the receipt of the One-Stop implementation grant. In response to the One-Stop initiative, state legislatures in these states expanded the mandate of these local boards to include policy oversight of local One-Stop systems. In three states (Iowa, Massachusetts, and Texas) the new One-Stop policy boards were given substantial authority over the design of local One-Stop services and the selection of local service providers.

The study states tended to provide less detailed guidelines for the day-to-day management of local One-Stop centers than they did for the structure of local policy boards (See Exhibit 1-6). Nonetheless, several states called for participatory management structures. For example, Iowa's guidelines for local One-Stop center management call for all partners to participate in the development of the center's

## Exhibit 1-6
## State Guidelines for Local One-Stop Governance and Day-to-Day Center Management

| | Local Governance | Center Management |
|---|---|---|
| Connecticut | In 1992, 9 JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) were expanded to form regional workforce development boards (RWDBs).<br>In 1994 the state legislature gave RWDBs responsibility for approval annual service plans developed by local One-Stop centers. | Centers are administered by local management committees co-chaired by the local ES/UI office manager and the staff director of the regional workforce development board.<br>Additional management committee members may represent public or non-profit entities. The management committee selects a center director. |
| Indiana | Each of the 16 regional planning units must develop a One-Stop policy structure that allows participation by all local stakeholders. Boards are usually expanded JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs).<br>Each of the 26 One-Stop centers must form an informal advisory board with representation by local stakeholders. | Planning, evaluation, and oversight of One-Stop centers is shared by local policy boards and the state Department of Workforce Development. |
| Iowa | Since the evaluation site visit, the state has undertaken the formation of advisory local workforce development policy boards. Local boards will play an important role in recommending local service providers to the state. | Centers must permit all partners to participate in decisions about the center mission, goals, resources, and facility oversight. Local centers may be administered by a management team or a designated center director. |

**Exhibit 1-6** (Continued)

| | Local Governance | Center Management |
|---|---|---|
| Maryland | Local service areas must develop a One-Stop planning and management team with participation by five persons: the PIC chair or representative, the Job Service manager, the JTPA service delivery area director, a community college representative, and one additional employer. | Co-location and co-administration of centers is not required. Each One-Stop center must be "hosted" by at least one of the three key agency partners. |
| Massachusetts | 16 regional employment boards are responsible for overseeing the restructured One-Stop workforce development system, including chartering center operators and approving service design. | Each career center operator must develop its own integrated management structure. Center operators may be public or private entities or consortia. |
| Minnesota | Minnesota has passed state legislation authorizing local workforce councils. The structure is determined by state statute, however, the size is determined at the local level. Planning for service delivery within the Workforce Centers is done annually by all partners. | Determined at local level. |
| Ohio | Ohio allows local flexibility in the creation of a local policy board. However, it must include representation from all stakeholders and be linked to JTPA Private Industry Council (PIC) and ES Job Service Employer Council (JSEC). | Determined at local level. |

## Exhibit 1-6
## State Guidelines for Local One-Stop Governance and Day-to-Day Center Management

| | Local Governance | Center Management |
|---|---|---|
| Connecticut | In 1992, 9 JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs) were expanded to form regional workforce development boards (RWDBs).<br>In 1994 the state legislature gave RWDBs responsibility for approval annual service plans developed by local One-Stop centers. | Centers are administered by local management committees co-chaired by the local ES/UI office manager and the staff director of the regional workforce development board.<br>Additional management committee members may represent public or non-profit entities. The management committee selects a center director. |
| Indiana | Each of the 16 regional planning units must develop a One-Stop policy structure that allows participation by all local stakeholders. Boards are usually expanded JTPA Private Industry Councils (PICs).<br>Each of the 26 One-Stop centers must form an informal advisory board with representation by local stakeholders. | Planning, evaluation, and oversight of One-Stop centers is shared by local policy boards and the state Department of Workforce Development. |
| Iowa | Since the evaluation site visit, the state has undertaken the formation of advisory local workforce development policy boards. Local boards will play an important role in recommending local service providers to the state. | Centers must permit all partners to participate in decisions about the center mission, goals, resources, and facility oversight. Local centers may be administered by a management team or a designated center director. |

mission and goals and in the oversight of the center facility and resources. Similarly, Wisconsin calls for centers to be managed by a "partnership of equals."

### Guiding the Design and Delivery of One-Stop Services

The One-Stop implementation states communicated their vision of transformed One-Stop services to local One-Stop partners in a variety of ways. Some states encouraged local One-Stop planners to visit "model" One-Stop centers in other states. Others sponsored the development of early pilot One-Stop centers within the state and then disseminated information about the most well-developed One-Stop pilot centers to other sites. Most sites developed written certification guidelines and descriptive evaluation criteria specifying what One-Stop centers would have to do to qualify for designation as an official state One-Stop center.

In this section, we describe how states tried to influence the design of local One-Stop services through guidelines specifying required universal and enhanced services for job seekers and employers. We also describe how states encouraged the integration of services under the One-Stop initiative.

#### Guidelines for Job Seeker Services

As described in more detail in Chapter 9, most states encouraged local One-Stop centers to develop a three-tiered structure for delivery of One-Stop services. Tier 1 services consist of services that customers can access with a minimum of staff assistance; these are commonly referred to as "self-service" options or "self-access" services. Tier 2 services consist of guided services—such as assessment, counseling, or brokering additional services—that require individualized attention from a One-Stop staff member, or brief group workshops. Tier 3 services consist of more intensive education and training services as well as ongoing counseling or case management services.

Exhibit 1-7 presents examples of states' requirements for the delivery of universal services for job seekers. These required universal services tended to be Tier 1 services. They include the following (listed in declining order of frequency):

- Automated job listings.
- Labor market information.
- Inventories of education and training opportunities.
- Information on careers.

## Exhibit 1-7
## Examples of State Guidelines for Universal Services for Job-Seekers

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Universal services must include automated job listings, labor market information, inventories of education and training opportunities, information on job search available through resource libraries, and orientation to customers interested in registering for ES or UI services (information about all services available through the center). Case management services may be provided to individuals not in categorical programs upon request. |
| Indiana | Required services include self-service registration, information, and assessment, orientation sessions describing available services, the provision of an information resource area or library, staff-directed services for intake, registration, counseling, assessment, and referral, the provision of a training area for testing and workshops. |
| Maryland | Each career center will have identical core services and technology and standardized materials in a local resource area. The state provides software and hardware for core automated services including a job-finding cluster, a career-exploration cluster, and a customer-development cluster. Local agency host must provide a resource area specialist to staff the resource room. |
| Minnesota | Minnesota has established 11 required universal services for job seekers: (1) service consultation and eligibility determination; (2) provision of a resource center; (3) access to Minnesota Career Information System; (4) labor market information; (5) information on required knowledge, skills, and abilities for jobs; (6) information on education and training programs; (7) job development and job listings; (8) information on employer hiring requirements; (9) preparation of employer profiles; (10) job matching services; and (11) referrals to support services. |
| Texas | Texas has identified six core services to be available at local workforce development centers: (1) labor market information; (2) common intake and eligibility determination; (3) independent assessment and the development of individual service strategies; (4) coordinated and continuous case management and counseling; (5) individual referral for services including basic education, classroom skills training, on-the-job training, and customized training; and (6) supportive services. |

- Self-service job search information available through resource areas or libraries.
- Self-assessment tools, such as self-administered career interest or aptitude inventories.
- Employer profiles, including descriptive materials on local firms, that job seekers can review to prepare for job interviews.

In addition, some states required One-Stop centers to provide to all customers unified "front-end" services, which may either be automated or guided by One-Stop staff. These services include the following:

- Common intake and initial eligibility determination.
- Orientation to available services.
- Information about and referral to categorical workforce development programs targeted to customers meeting specific eligibility criteria.
- Referral to non-DOL agencies and services, including social services, vocational rehabilitation, and basic education, post-secondary education, or vocational education programs.
- Referral to support services available from One-Stop partners or through referral to other community agencies.

Several states also required that local One-Stop centers provide all job seekers with some services from Tier 2. Examples include the following:

- Assistance with job search, job matching or job development needs (Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Ohio).
- Basic needs assessment and counseling to help customers identify relevant services (Indiana, Massachusetts, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin).
- Case management upon request (Connecticut, Texas, and Wisconsin).

Several states encouraged local One-Stop sites to make additional Tier 2 and Tier 3 services available to all One-Stop customers. For example, Connecticut recommended that One-Stop centers make available to all job seekers workshops on pre-employment skills, vocational exploration, job search skills, and other topics. Maryland encouraged local sites to supplement the standardized automated CareerNet services by adding compatible technology-based services as well as staffed services (such as workshops). Several states invited local sites to develop a menu of enhanced services available to job-seeker customers for a fee.

### Guidelines for Employer Services

Most states offered less detailed guidance about services to employers, perhaps because their initial attention was focused primarily on redesigning One-Stop job-seeker services. Nonetheless, three of the nine case study states prepared blueprints describing the universal and enhanced employer services that were required for certification of local One-Stop centers (See Exhibit 1-8). Each of these states—Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Minnesota—emphasized the importance of providing a wide range of business services.

Universal employer services required by these three states included the following:

- Labor exchange services (e.g., job listings, job matching, job development, and recruitment, screening, and referral of job applicants).
- Information about and referral to economic development services and other government-funded programs for hiring or training targeted workers by qualifying firms.

One or more states required One-Stop centers to make available to all employers the following additional services:

- A skills-based job-seeker pool for review by employers (using the Talent Bank or a state-initiated skills bank).
- Information relevant to business needs, including labor market information and information about regulations for government programs.
- Management and business consulting services, to be provided through linkages to agencies with expertise in this area.
- Seminars on topics of interest to local employers.

Government-funded services that one or more states required local One-Stop centers to provide to eligible firms included the following:

- Downsizing support to employers and their workers, provided by the state's dislocated worker unit and rapid response teams.
- Assistance with customized training, manufacturing and technology assistance, and apprenticeship training programs.

Two of these states—Massachusetts and Minnesota—also encouraged One-Stop centers to develop fee-based services for employers, including customized applicant testing and screening services, the customized analysis of labor market information,

## Exhibit 1-8
## Examples of State Guidelines for Services for Employers

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | To qualify as a One-Stop center, the following business services must be available: (1) *labor exchange and recruitment services*, including job listings, job matching, job development, recruitment and screening of applicants, and post-referral follow-up of applicants; (2) *workplace consultation services*, including assistance to employers to help them maintain or attain competitiveness; (3) *workforce development services*, including assistance with customized training, manufacturing and technology assistance, and apprenticeship training programs; and (4) *downsizing support* to employers and their workers. |
| Massachusetts | Core services for employers must include screening and referral of job applicants, on-line access to job bank, and referral to sources of funds for worker training. Non-core or enhanced services must be provided by each career center. However, the content, delivery system, and fee structures are to be determined locally. |
| Minnesota | Centers must have the following universal services available for employers: (1) an employer library and employer seminars; (2) a skill-based job-seeker pool for review by employers; (3) information from agencies specializing in different types of disabilities about how to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act; (4) provision of available labor market information; (5) referral to economic development services; (6) information about and referral to customized training supports and other employer subsidies; (7) provision of other universal employer services, including job development, access to the statewide job bank, resume-matching services, hiring advice, and information on government regulations for such programs as workers compensation, equal opportunity, and unemployment insurance.<br>Centers must also provide enhanced services for employers (fee-based or eligibility-based services) including case management services from a designated account representative, employer-requested testing of job candidates, provision of business data and customized analysis of labor market information, customized employee training, skills assessments of incumbent workers, and employer subsidies for hiring or training targeted workers. |

assessment of the skills of incumbent workers, and customized training for incumbent workers or new hires.

### Guidelines on the Co-Location and Integration of Services

State guidelines about how different partners should be involved in the operation of One-Stop centers varied substantially. At one extreme, states required or strongly encouraged staff of DOL-mandated One-Stop programs to be co-located within the same physical facility (e.g., Connecticut, Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, and Texas). At the other extreme, Maryland and Ohio emphasized the importance of "well-articulated referral linkages," but left it up to the local partners to decide whether they would be co-located or not, and if co-located, whether they would integrate services across program boundaries. In between these two extremes were states like Iowa and Wisconsin, that strongly recommended co-location of staff from all mandated DOL programs and development of integrated service approaches, but which recognized that local conditions might make this infeasible for some local One-Stop systems.

States also provided differing guidelines to local One-Stop centers about how to further the federal goal of integrating One-Stop services. As summarized in Exhibit 1-9, state guidelines for integration of services ranged from encouraging coordinated services to strongly encouraging fully integrated services.

Two states—Ohio and Maryland—deferred to local discretion in the design of integrated services. These states took a non-prescriptive approach, requiring only improved coordination among local One-Stop partners. Local One-Stop systems in these states were encouraged to design their own local models for the delivery of One-Stop services. Local models could range from a "no wrong door" approach, without co-location of partners, to a fully-integrated approach with integrated staffing and an integrated menu of One-Stop services. For example, in Maryland, the minimum requirements for certification as a One-Stop center are: (1) the availability of required universal information services, including the state's automated JobNet system, at a service site hosted by one of the local One-Stop agency partners, and (2) the provision of a staff person trained as a resource information specialist to help customers access the information in the resource library and automated information system.

**Exhibit 1-9**
**State Guidelines on Service Integration**

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Connecticut encourages JTPA, ES, and UI staff to play coordinated service roles within One-Stop centers. To be certified, local centers must describe their approach to integration of services and programs. Although unified intake is not mandated, the state supports local development and implementation of common forms and reforming systems across programs.<br>Ultimately, the state anticipates that services will be integrated across a number of different related public-sector programs, including business services, labor exchange, economic development, education, human services, and training programs. |
| Indiana | Indiana requires co-location of staff providing services under JTPA, ES, UI, Veterans Employment Services, and Older Worker programs under Title V of the Older Americans Act. Local service delivery areas must develop integrated service contracts between the agencies responsible for JTPA and ES/UI services. These contracts are designed to support cost-allocation plans that enable centers to cross-staff the functions of reception, UI registration, job placement, and career counseling. |
| Iowa | State guidelines call for the integrated design and delivery of basic services, such as reception, orientation, assessment, and access to career information. Technology is seen as key to integrating the delivery of information services. |
| Maryland | The key feature of service integration within One-Stop centers as required by the state of Maryland is the delivery of a standardized and integrated menu of core information services via the state's automated JobNet system. However, individual local sites may chose whatever level of service integration they want in their local One-Stop system designs, ranging from separate electronically-linked partners, to multi-service centers with coordinated but separate operations by on-site partners, to integrated staffing roles and services across program partners. |
| Minnesota | Each local workforce council must develop a plan for the integration of services across ES, UI, and JTPA partners, which must be co-located within One-Stop centers. The state requires cross-training of staff and requires centers to "promote integration" of intake, eligibility determination, assessment, case management, and delivery of services to profiled workers. |

**Exhibit 1-9** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | To encourage service integration, Ohio requires certified One-Stop centers to provide all customers with universal registration, cross-trained staff, and access to uniform self-service tools. Full co-location of all partners is not required. |
| Texas | Texas has mandated the development of integrated intake, eligibility determination, and coordinated case management and counseling as required universal One-Stop services. |
| Wisconsin | In its Job Center standards, Wisconsin calls for unified procedures for intake, assessment, case management, area-wide planning, and the provision of labor market information and job search training and assistance. |

Both states encouraged staff from all local partners to increase their familiarity with the services available from other programs, so that they could better coordinate cross-program referrals.

A second group of states, including Iowa, Minnesota, Texas, and Wisconsin, designed more ambitious guidelines for the integration of universal One-Stop services. These states required local centers to plan for unified procedures for intake, assessment, and case management services across all local One-Stop partners. These states also encouraged or required One-Stop centers to develop unified designs for providing labor market information, job search training and assistance, and the delivery of services to profiled UI claimants (i.e., those identified as likely to encounter difficulty in finding a new job). However, in their detailed guidance to local sites, these states often recommended that local partners deliver integrated services by having each partner specialize and "do what it does best," rather than by creating integrated service delivery teams with pooled staff from multiple agencies.

A third group of states enthusiastically encouraged cross-staffing and consolidating One-Stop services across different local partners. Connecticut and Indiana encouraged and supported efforts by local One-Stop partners (particularly JTPA, ES, and UI partners) to cross-train staff to provide services to customers eligible for several different categorical programs. For example, all JPTA, ES, and UI staff in the Indiana's pilot One-Stop center in Indianapolis were cross-trained to take UI applications, assist with job placement services, and provide career counseling to all One-Stop customers.

### GOAL 4. PROMOTING COORDINATION OF ONE-STOP SYSTEM-BUILDING EFFORTS AMONG STATE AND LOCAL PARTNERS

In addition to disseminating their state's vision of One-Stop systems through written guides, the staff of state One-Stop project teams have developed a number of informal mechanisms to promote state–local information exchanges and coordinate state and local One-Stop implementation efforts. (See Exhibit 1-10.) Among the most frequently used are the following mechanisms:

- Convening local One-Stop center managers for regular meetings designed to share information between state and local staff, identify emerging implementation problems, and promote networking and sharing of best practices among local One-Stop practitioners.

**Exhibit 1-10**

**Examples of State Coordination Efforts**

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Three full-time staff in a One-Stop project office within the Connecticut Department of Labor act as brokering agents for the system as a whole. Project staff help local sites through the process leading to certification.<br>The state convenes local JTPA and ES/UI office managers for statewide quarterly management team meetings. These meetings are used to promote peer networking and to alert state staff of potential implementation problems. |
| Indiana | The state has designated a local Department of Workforce Development agency employee to be the One-Stop program director in each region. These staff report on local system-development efforts to the state agency's field operations director.<br>The state conducts monthly conference calls between state and local One-Stop staff and holds a face-to-face meeting at least once every six months. State specialists in ES, UI, and Veterans Employment Service issues provide individualized support to local career center staff as needed. At the time of the evaluation site visit, the state planned to develop a state-local management team that will share information and review the implementation process. |
| Iowa | To support local One-Stop design and implementation efforts, a member of the state One-Stop project team was designated as a liaison to local sites. The state has developed a newsletter as a way to share information among state and local One-Stop partners. |
| Massachusetts | During the One-Stop implementation phase, the state Career Center Office has emerged as the primary facilitator of communication and coordination between the state and regional employment boards and between the state and individual career center operators. |
| Maryland | During the first year of One-Stop planning and early implementation, the state lead agency issued monthly One-Stop newsletters and disseminated them to local One-Stop staff. During the second year of the One-Stop implementation grant, several new coordination mechanisms were being developed, including (1) the establishment of state liaisons to serve as facilitators and consultants to local centers; and (2) the convening of monthly meetings between local resource area specialists and state staff responsible for designing and maintaining the automated CareerNet system. |

**Exhibit 1-10** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Minnesota | During the summer of 1996, key state officials toured the state for two months inviting local partners to detail their One-Stop vision and discuss obstacles. Issues teams with membership by both state and local representatives have discussed the respective roles and responsibilities of the state and local areas in One-Stop planning and implementation.<br>Job Service and JTPA directors meet quarterly. As a result of these quarterly meetings, they have agreed on a statewide system of benchmarks for certifying local workforce centers. |
| Ohio | The state project manager disseminates the reports prepared by the state task groups to local work groups and vice versa. A monthly newsletter called "The One-Stop Link" is also used to share information between state and local partners.<br>The state convenes a periodic "partners helping partners" conference to promote exchange of information about best practices among local One-Stop staff. |
| Texas | The state One-Stop project team has convened regional forums to communicate about One-Stop issues with local staff. The team channels information from local sites to members of state-level task groups responsible for designing different aspects of the One-Stop system. Informal and interactive meetings are the rule.<br>The state project team conducts formal bi-annual benchmarking visits to each center and obtain regular progress reports, both formal and informal, on the progress of One-Stop implementation. |
| Wisconsin | Wisconsin has designated local liaisons to facilitate communication between the state and local One-Stop centers.<br>Informational memoranda are circulated to members of local collaborative planning teams.<br>Statewide and regional meetings and conferences are used to discuss One-Stop implementation issues. |

- Assigning specific state staff as local site liaisons, responsible for helping local One-Stop sites through the process leading to state certification, and providing individualized support and consultations.
- Designating a state employee as the on-site local One-Stop program manager within each local region, responsible for brokering and coordinating among local partners and reporting progress to the state One-Stop project team.
- Holding monthly telephone conference calls to keep state and local One-Stop staff aware of each others' activities.
- Distributing a state newsletter to keep local areas informed about One-Stop development issues and progress, during the initial planning stages.

The staff in the study states have usually been careful to define their various roles as those of partner, counselor, advisor, and facilitator, rather than those of dictator, monitor, auditor, or imposer of sanctions. In most cases, states and local partners have attempted to develop new relationships suitable to their shared responsibility for a workforce development system that is funded from both state-administered and locally-administered program resources.

### ANALYSIS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN GUIDING LOCAL ONE-STOP SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT

In their decisions about how to organize and guide One-Stop system development, the study states have been influenced by their organizational histories, including the previous relationships among different state workforce development agencies and between state and local systems.

Sites with an extensive history of collaboration between the agencies responsible for JTPA, ES, and UI were clearly at an advantage when they began planning One-Stop systems. For example, Indiana and Wisconsin each had a ten-year history of increasing collaboration between the JTPA, ES, and UI agencies in workforce development planning and service delivery prior to the One-Stop initiative. This history clearly facilitated efforts to develop strong coordination of JTPA ES, and UI services within local One-Stop centers. During the early 1990s, staff from Connecticut's JTPA, ES, and UI programs had worked together to develop "transition centers" for dislocated workers. This recent experience had transformed the managers of these two programs from distant and cautious strangers into familiar allies and prepared the way for increased collaboration between the JTPA, ES, and UI programs under the One-Stop initiative.

Histories that include strong welfare/workforce development program linkages have assisted several states in developing broad One-Stop partnerships that incorporate responsibility for welfare-to-work initiatives. In both Iowa and Texas, One-Stop initiatives were initially developed as strategies to reduce welfare dependency. As a result, the service approaches encouraged by state and local One-Stop partnerships have tended to integrate the delivery of welfare-to-work services into the rest of the One-Stop system. Similarly, in Wisconsin, where welfare-to-work issues have received substantial attention from state and local One-Stop planners, the One-Stop system has been designated as the delivery system for welfare-to-work services.

Past collaboration with additional workforce development programs has also helped to strengthen involvement by these programs within state and local One-Stop systems. For example, in Minnesota, the Vocational Rehabilitation program has been part of the agency that administers ES, UI, and JTPA for 20 years. As a result, vocational rehabilitation is integrated into local One-Stop systems throughout the state.

One-Stop implementation states were also influenced by the traditional balance between state control and local autonomy in the relation between state and local workforce development entities. For example, Ohio and Texas were both characterized by strong local autonomy—not just for workforce development programs, but across all areas of government. This tradition, developed in response to the strongly differentiated needs of dense urban areas and sparsely populated rural areas, caused these states to provide for substantial local discretion and autonomy in the design and oversight of local One-Stop systems. In contrast, Maryland took advantage of a tradition of strong state leadership in workforce development programs to develop a relatively standardized design for One-Stop services statewide. However, the state recognized the importance of the city of Baltimore as another strong player in state-local relations and welcomed Baltimore's complementary leadership role in developing a wide range of staffed One-Stop services to supplement the state's automated menu of services.

During the initial stages of One-Stop planning and implementation the study states have accomplished the following:

- Formed broad state interagency partnerships.

- Developed participatory task forces and work groups that have permitted each partner agency to have a voice in the detailed design and implementation of their state's One-Stop system.
- Created state policy groups responsible for overseeing the detailed design and implementation of local One-Stop career center systems.
- Developed broad policy groups that are coordinating the welfare-to-work, school-to-work, and One-Stop initiatives (some states only).
- Designated state management teams responsible for furthering their state's One-Stop goals and objectives, and staffed these teams with individuals who possess the specialized skills necessary to support state and local system development.
- Developed guidelines for One-Stop system development that are clear enough to communicate the federal and state One-Stop vision and flexible enough to promote local innovation and support local diversity within and across local One-Stop systems.

Among the challenges currently facing a number of the study states are the following:

- *How to maintain active participation by all state One-Stop planning partners over time.* In some states, initial participation by a large number of state agencies in One-Stop planning has been replaced by the day-to-day administration of One-Stop systems by a single lead agency. To maintain the benefits of broad partnerships, a number of states are considering how to involve all state partners in ongoing planning and oversight of the One-Stop system.
- *How to balance the desire to encourage local innovation and local "ownership" of One-Stop systems with the need to weave local One-Stop centers into a coherent state One-Stop system.* A number of states started out during the earliest stages of the One-Stop initiative by encouraging individual pilot sites to invent One-Stop systems "from scratch." Thereafter, states felt they needed to systematize the different One-Stop approaches and develop state guidelines for the second generation of local One-Stop sites. A number of states are still working out an appropriate balance between requiring statewide consistency and encouraging local innovation.
- *How to continue to support expansion of the One-Stop system to new local sites, some of which may be considerably less enthusiastic about the benefits of service integration than the earlier One-Stop sites.* Most states encouraged the local areas with the most advanced ideas and practices to participate during the first phase of local implementation. They are now grappling with how to create a statewide system by

encouraging One-Stop development in local areas that may need substantially more help building partnerships and designing integrated services.

The next steps each state needs to take in guiding One-Stop system development depend on the current status of its system development. States that have made substantial progress in building partnerships involving the DOL-funded programs but have not yet accomplished "buy-in" from or coordination with a wider range of school-to-work and welfare-to-work partners plan to broaden state and local partnerships to include a larger set of workforce development programs and agencies. States that have concentrated on building a few strong One-Stop pilot sites during the first stage of One-Stop implementation plan to support dissemination of One-Stop systems and centers to additional service areas, and, within service areas with only one operating center, to additional centers.

Across all states, state One-Stop policy makers are beginning to think about what the ongoing state role should be in guiding One-Stop systems after the system-building process has been completed and all local One-Stop centers have gained initial certification.

# 2. BUILDING LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS AND GOVERNING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

## INTRODUCTION

In most states, the detailed design and day-to-day management of One-Stop services occurs at the local level. The initiation of local One-Stop systems begins with the formation of a partnership of workforce development agencies, whose managers agree that their agencies share common goals and will mutually benefit from increased collaboration. The acknowledgment that local job seekers and employers will also benefit from a transformed service delivery system is often necessary to inspire the local planning and implementation process. The change process itself often requires careful planning, the gradual development of trust between managers and staff of the partnering agencies, and a willingness to compromise. In this chapter we discuss how local partnerships have been formed and the different organizational structures that have been developed to oversee One-Stop systems and provide One-Stop services.

## GOALS FOR ONE-STOP ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

Each of the case study sites faced several distinct challenges, including the following:

1. Building effective local partnerships.
2. Organizing One-Stop career centers into local systems.
3. Forming effective local governance structures.
4. Staffing day-to-day One-Stop operations.

Overcoming each of these challenges became an important goal for the case study sites.

## GOAL 1. BUILDING EFFECTIVE LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS

In building local One-Stop partnerships, the case study sites were influenced by a number of different factors, including their previous relationships with other workforce development agencies, their state's requirements for participation by different agencies, and their ability to develop collaborative relationships with parallel welfare-to-work and school-to-work system-building efforts.

### History of Collaboration

None of the case study sites undertook the development of an integrated One-Stop system in a vacuum. In most cases, previous experience collaborating or coordinating with other local workforce development agencies was critical to the willingness of local workforce development agencies to form One-Stop partnerships. As described in Exhibit 2-1, factors that were influential in the formation of One-Stop partnerships in a number of case study sites included: (1) a history of collaboration between the local agencies responsible for JTPA, ES, and UI services, which was the result of strong state leadership or previous experience coordinating services targeted to dislocated workers; (2) a strong history of collaboration between workforce development programs, welfare-to-work programs, and social service delivery systems; (3) a general tradition of interagency collaborative approaches to community problems; and (4) an interest in revitalizing the local Employment Services. In local areas with one or more of these kinds of histories, partnership formation around One-Stop system development occurred more easily than in sites without histories of collaboration.

Indiana is a good example of how a history of collaboration influenced One-Stop partnership formation. For the past decade, Indiana had encouraged the co-location and integration of service delivery systems for JTPA, ES, and UI, which prepared local agencies for participation in local One-Stop partnerships. In both sites that we visited, ES, UI, and JTPA already had a long history of co-location and collaborative service approaches when they were designated the core on-site partners in the development of One-Stop centers. This history enabled the agencies responsible for JTPA, ES, and UI to make substantial progress in implementing integrated staffing arrangements.

Similarly, previous collaboration in serving dislocated workers was decisive in making the ES, UI, and JTPA agencies willing to consider forming local One-Stop partnerships in New London, Connecticut, and Baltimore, Maryland. In Connecticut, the local ES and JTPA agencies had worked together in the late 1980s and early 1990s to create a series of jointly operated "transition centers" for dislocated workers. As a result, they developed increased familiarity with each others' services and started thinking of each other as allies in meeting customers' needs. Similarly, partnerships between ES and JTPA agencies in Baltimore grew out of coordinated efforts to develop "customer-driven" services for dislocated workers, as well as early intervention services for UI applicants under the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services system. As a result of these experiences, local agencies in Baltimore had already

**Exhibit 2-1**
**Examples of Initiating One-Stop Partnerships**

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | As a result of collaborating in the development of transition centers for dislocated workers in the early 1990s, local ES/UI and JTPA agencies have developed increased familiarity with each other's services and started thinking of each other as allies in meeting customers' needs. |
| Indiana | The state of Indiana has been moving toward the integration of JTPA, ES, and UI services within One-Stop centers since 1984. Thus, there is an extended hxistory of co-location and local partnership development among these core program partners. The inclusion of additional programs within local One-Stop partnerships is more recent and it has been more challenging to develop a model for integrating staff from additional partner agencies (including adult and vocational education program entities) into the operation of local One-Stop centers. |
| Iowa | The planning and development of a One-Stop center in Des Moines builds on the pre-existing co-location of many workforce development partners and programs in a single facility in downtown Des Moines. However, prior to the One-Stop initiative, agencies were more interested in coordination of separate programs than they were in collaboration or consolidation of services. Preparing the One-Stop Implementation Grant application was the catalyst for thinking about the potential for integration of services. |
| Maryland | Local One-Stop partners in Baltimore began planning for the development of an integrated menu of employment and training services that would transcend agency and program boundaries nearly a year before the state of Maryland received its One-Stop Implementation Grant. Initial discussions of how to integrate services focused on the transformation of services to meet the needs of dislocated workers. Previous Job Service and JTPA service models were not varied enough to meet the diverse needs of the dislocated worker population. Coordinated efforts by local Job Service and JTPA partners to develop "customer-driven" services for dislocated workers as well as early intervention services for UI recipients under the Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services Program were catalysts in the movement to reengineer and consolidate local workforce development services. |

**Exhibit 2-1** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Maryland, continued | After receiving an ES Revitalization grant in the fall of 1994 to create a "Resource Area" for individual customers, the Columbia center was in an ideal position to become a local One-Stop pilot. Local respondents believed that being a pilot site was a "luxury" that afforded them numerous opportunities, including the chance to try out new equipment, system features, and processes. Moreover, being directly involved in statewide One-Stop design and implementation and, in general, "having the state's ear" were cited as both fortuitous and beneficial. |
| Minnesota | One-Stop implementation in Anoka County has been built on a strong foundation of collaboration among workforce development and social service providers at both at the state and local level. In Anoka County, the first steps toward a consolidated workforce center came in 1988, when the Anoka County Board of Commissioners and the Anoka County Private Industry Council (PIC) integrated welfare employment and training programs with JTPA and other employment and training initiatives within the Anoka County service delivery area (SDA). In 1991, a large group of workforce development and human service agencies relocated to a new shared physical facility—the Anoka County Human Service Center.<br>Anoka County also has a decade-long history of developing innovative interagency collaborative approaches to community problems. The experience of Anoka County with the Minnesota Parents' Fair Share (MNPFS) in the mid-1980s is one early example of forming "fusion teams"—bringing together diverse county, state, and non-profit agencies to work toward a common goal. These and other collaborative management approaches have provided a model that has guided the development of Anoka's Workforce Center. |

**Exhibit 2-1** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | Local planning for improved system coordination and integration in Wood County began in 1994, when representatives from a number of local agencies met to develop applications for Governor's Reserve Funds for JTPA Special Projects and OBES-sponsored UI Collaboration Grants to establish "one-stop shops" for dislocated workers. Wood County agencies also built on their experiences developing an inter-agency human resources case management network for individuals receiving assistance from the welfare system. As part of this case management system, a variety of human service-related agencies had begun meeting on a monthly basis to foster mutual referrals and overall coordination efforts. In addition, JOBS and Wood County JTPA were co-located in what is now the Wood County Employment Resource Center. In that partnership, they provided "whatever services were needed" to welfare and JTPA -eligible clients. As a result of these collaboration efforts, these two agencies began to develop closer ties with OBES-funded programs, since it became obvious that job search and employment services were an essential element of the services to promote client well-being and self-sufficiency. |
| Texas | The Arlington Center traces its history to a 1992 study conducted by United Way which identified unemployment, underemployment, and skills deficits among Arlington adults. In response to this study, local officials and community leaders formed a multi-agency team in the summer of 1993, with the goal of developing plans for a locally-based integrated workforce development system. |
| Wisconsin | Key partner agencies, each representing major funding streams, had been working collaboratively for several years prior to the opening of the Center. JTPA/Title III experiences were credited as providing the opportunity for some of the initial forays into coordinated service delivery (e.g., through rapid response teams that included participation from a number of different local agencies). |

recognized the need to consolidate local workforce development services nearly a year before the state received the One-Stop implementation grant.

In several other case study sites, previous experiences collaborating to serve welfare recipients created fertile ground for the development of expanded One-Stop partnerships. For example, the One-Stop partnerships in Anoka County, Minnesota, grew out of a 1988 decision by the county board of commissioners and the JTPA private industry council (PIC) to integrate welfare employment and training programs with JTPA. Similarly, in Wood County, Ohio, the One-Stop Employment Resource Center grew directly out of previous co-location and service consolidation between JTPA and the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) program for AFDC recipients. As a result of their ongoing collaboration efforts, the two programs began to develop closer ties with the ES when it became obvious that job search and employment services were an essential element of services to promote customer self-sufficiency.

A decade-long community tradition of developing interagency approaches to solve community problems was also influential in Anoka County. For example, in the mid-1980s, this community developed "fusion teams," which brought together diverse county, state, and non-profit agencies to work toward a common goal, as part of a "fair share" program to encourage non-custodial parents to pay their share of child support expenses.

### Breadth of Local Partnerships

Local case study sites varied substantially in the numbers and types of agencies included in local One-Stop partnerships and in the roles played by different partners. In most cases, a distinction was made between *core partners,* which participated both in planning the local One-Stop system and in delivering One-Stop services, and *supporting partners,* which participated in overall planning and coordination meetings, but which often played a less active role in delivering services to One-Stop customers. The number of different agencies involved in planning and overseeing local One-Stop system development ranged from 5 agencies in Baltimore to 25 agencies in Anoka County, Minnesota.

Exhibit 2-2 summarizes the breadth of the local One-Stop partnerships across the case study sites. Exhibit 2-3 describes the specific agencies involved in the local partnerships in selected sites. In many cases, the breadth of the partnerships was strongly influenced by the state's One-Stop certification requirements. However, some

## Exhibit 2-2
## Local Agencies Involved in One-Stop Planning and Service Delivery

Key:
✓ = Core Partners
+ = Supporting Partners

| | New London, CT | Willimantic, CT | Creston, IA | Des Moines, IA | Indianapolis, IN | Lawrenceburg, IN | Baltimore, MD | Columbia, MD | Springfield, MA | Blaine, MN | Bowling Green, OH | Arlington, TX | Lake Jackson, TX | Pewaukee, WI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total Number of Local Partners** | 9 | 8 | 9 | 15 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 6 | N/A | 25 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 9 |
| ES/UI/VETS Agency | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Job Training Partnership Act Entity | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Community or Technical Colleges | + | ✓ | + | ✓ | | + | ✓ | ✓ | | + | ✓ | ✓ | + | ✓ |
| K-12 Education Agencies | | ✓ | + | | | | | | + | + | | ✓ | + | |
| Vocational Rehabilitation Agency | | | ✓ | | + | + | | | | ✓ | + | ✓ | | |
| Income Maintenance Agency | + | + | + | | + | + | | + | | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ |
| State or Local Economic Development Agency | + | + | | | | | | ✓ | | | | | | ✓ |
| Older Workers Administrative Entity | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | + | + | | | | ✓ | + | ✓ | + | ✓ |
| Community-Based Organization(s) and Service Provider Organization(s) | + | | | + | ✓ | | ✓ | + | + | + | + | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

## Exhibit 2-3
## Examples of the Breadth of Local One-Stop Partnerships

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | In the New London One-Stop center, “managing” partners include the state Department of Labor (which administers the ES and UI programs) and the local Workforce Development Board (which administers local JTPA-funded services).<br>Additional planning partners include the state Department of Economic and Community Development, the state Department of Social Services, and the state Department of Higher Education, a regional economic development corporation, the local technical college, a non-profit service provider with a history of providing services to welfare recipients, and a proprietary agency with a history of providing service to dislocated workers. |
| Indiana | Core partners at the Eastside Center of the Indianapolis Network for Employment and Training (iNET) include the state Department of Workforce Development (which administers UI, ES, and Veterans Employment Services) and the Goodwill Industries of Central Indiana, which is the contracted service provider for the delivery of JTPA-funded services.<br>Supporting partners at the Eastside Center include the Central Indiana Council on Aging (which administers Title V Older Workers services), Job Corps, the Family Social Services agency (which operates welfare-to-work programs at one of the One-Stop centers), and the local provider of vocational rehabilitation services. Local respondents noted that the weakest aspect of its current partnerships is the lack of active involvement in planning and service delivery by education agencies, including school-to-work and vocational education systems. |
| | In the Lawrenceburg Workforce Development Center, supporting partners also include the local branch of the technical college system, the county mental health services, the local small business development center, an organization serving migrant farmworkers, and an agency operating anti-poverty programs. Coordination between on-site partners and these supporting partners is informal in nature. |

**Exhibit 2-3** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Iowa | Core partners at the Creston Workforce Development Center include the Job Service division of the Iowa Workforce Development Department (responsible for ES, UI, and Veterans Employment Services as well as welfare-to-work services), the local JTPA administrative entity, the state division of vocational rehabilitation, and a state-funded older worker program.<br>Additional supportive partners represented on formal and informal planning groups include the state welfare agency, the local community college, the extension campuses of several state post-secondary educational institutions, and the local primary and secondary school systems. |
| | The Des Moines Workforce Development Center involves active participation by eight core partners (represented on the Partners' Group), including the state agency responsible for ES, UI, and Veterans Employment Services; the local JTPA Title II administrative entity; the designated JTPA Title III administrative entity, the local community college, the state division of vocational rehabilitation (VR), the agency operating Title V programs for older workers, a non-profit agency that is funded by the state VR agency to serve individuals with serious barriers to employment, and the administrator of several Job Corps centers in the state.<br>Supplementary partners that also have an on-site presence at the center include the area agency on aging, a for-profit agency serving individuals with disabilities, and a state-funded program that matches welfare recipients to volunteer mentors.<br>Affiliated agencies include the state welfare agency, the state department for the blind, and several county agencies funded by the welfare agency to provide intensive case management services to individuals with serious barriers to self-sufficiency. |
| Maryland | The local planning team responsible for developing the Baltimore One-Stop network plan included representatives of the entities responsible for the major funding streams—the local community college, the ES and UI agency, and the JTPA administrative entity—as well as the key JTPA service providers for Title II and Title III. The JTPA agency also provided a strong link to the mayoral administration.<br>Agencies with staff housed on-site at the Baltimore Eastside Center include primarily the staff employed by the JTPA administrative entity, supplemented by 4 state Job Service staff. A nurse assistant funded by the city health department has office hours at the center once a week. |

**Exhibit 2-3** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Maryland, continued | Four primary partners involved in planning and overseeing the Columbia Career Center include the JTPA administrative entity, the local office of the ES and UI agency, the local community college, and the local economic development authority, which operates a "business resource center."<br>Two additional supporting partners include the local welfare agency and a private non-profit service provider that offers on-site workshops to JTPA-eligible customers. |
| Massachusetts | If a totally integrated funding stream had been achieved, the Hamden County career centers would have "leapfrogged" the difficult process of building local partnerships by establishing a single career center operator responsible for all workforce development services. At present, however, the operator of FutureWorks Career Center is functioning as a broker of services in an environment in which a number of different service providers are still operating.<br>Agencies with which FutureWorks coordinates include public and private workforce development agencies, community-based organizations, education and training providers, and its "sister" One-Stop center (with which it maintains a friendly competitive relationship). |
| Minnesota | In 1995, after four years of co-location and increasingly collaborative planning, the county's JTPA administrative entity, the local ES/UI office, and the Division of Rehabilitation Services (DRS) joined together to form the "Minnesota Workforce Center–Anoka County." In June, 1996, the Anoka County Income Maintenance Department and Child Care Assistance became co-located partners within the Workforce Center. State Services for the Blind (SSB) is also considered an official partner although it does not have staff housed at the Center.<br>In addition, the core public agency partners in the Anoka County Workforce Center are co-located with twenty other human services and education providers in a clean and modern building known as the Anoka County Human Service Center. One observer has termed this a "center around the center,"—a Workforce Center housed within a larger social service complex in which a range of services are available, including educational, counseling, income maintenance, and various support services. |

**Exhibit 2-3** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | Full-time partners at the Wood County Employment Resource Center include the JTPA and welfare-to-work program staff. Additional partners, which station staff at the center at least one half-day per week include the agencies responsible for ES, UI, Title V of the Older Americans Act, and the county vocational school.<br>Supporting partners include vocational rehabilitation, United Way, a local child care agency, a veterans assistance center, and local social service organizations. |
| Texas | Key partners in the Arlington Career Center that also provide on-site services include the JTPA administrative entity, the state agency responsible for ES, UI and the vocational rehabilitation program, the local junior college, a non-profit JTPA-funded training provider, a local school district, the Title V older worker program, and the county welfare agency.<br>Additional supporting partners include additional local school districts, human service agencies, and the continuing education division of the University of Texas. |
| Wisconsin | What has emerged as the Waukesha County Workforce Development Center is the product of several years of discussions among key staff from the participating local partners, including the Wisconsin Job Service, the WOW Private Industry Council, the Waukesha County Technical College, the Waukesha County Department of Health and Human Services, the Waukesha County Economic Development Corporation, and Partners for Education, Inc. The active involvement of the County Executive is also credited with providing the leadership that helped the participating partners see beyond their individual concerns to a common mission and customer service approach.<br>In addition two non-profit and one for-profit service provider agencies are considered core partners at the center. |

sites developed extremely broad partnerships on their own initiative, while others did not involve any partners that the state did not require be involved.

With the exception of the FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield, Massachusetts—which was operated by a single private for-profit entity chartered by the regional employment board to deliver One-Stop services—the case study sites all had both the JTPA and ES/UI agencies as core partners.

The number and types of additional local partners varied substantially from site to site.

- *Community or technical colleges* were core partners in seven sites and supporting partners in another five sites. The roles played by these partners varied from site to site. In several sites, community colleges provided on-site education services. In other sites, community college staff visited One-Stop centers periodically to provide information and referral to education and training programs. In yet other sites, community colleges simply received referrals or funding support from on-site partners to train One-Stop customers.
- Agencies responsible for operating *older worker programs* were core partners in four sites and supporting partners in another four sites. In most sites, designated staff from older worker agencies provided on-site services to One-Stop customers who qualified for assistance from these programs. In several sites, Title V participants played important service roles within centers, by serving as receptionists or resource aides.
- *Secondary educational institutions* were core partners in one site and supporting partners in another four sites. Secondary institutions were usually involved in (1) developing plans about how youth could use One-Stop information services on-site or through remote access, and (2) coordinating school-to-work and One-Stop activities. In several sites, these educational institutions provided adult basic education or English language training services on site.
- *Vocational rehabilitation agencies* were core partners in three sites and supporting partners in another three sites. In the three sites in which they were considered core partners, vocational rehabilitation staff provided on-site services to One-Stop customers on a part-time or full-time basis. Additional local partners specializing in services to individuals with disabilities were also on-site service providers in several sites. For example, the human resources center within which the Anoka County (Minnesota) Workforce Center is housed also houses an agency providing sheltered work for individuals with developmental disabilities.

- State or local agencies responsible for *income maintenance programs* were core partners in three sites, and supporting partners in another five sites. In the centers in Anoka County, Minnesota, and Waukesha County, Wisconsin, entire income-maintenance units of the county social services departments were co-located at the One-Stop center. In other sites, welfare agencies were represented by staff responsible for welfare-to-work services or staff offering supportive services to welfare recipients.
- *State or local economic development agencies* were core partners in two sites and supporting partners in another site. In Columbia, Maryland, Waukesha County, Wisconsin, and New London, Connecticut these agencies played particularly important roles in the delivery of services to business customers.
- *Local community-based organizations and organizations providing services* under JTPA or welfare-to-work programs were core local One-Stop partners in five sites and supporting partners in another 6 sites. Although some sites considered only public agencies to be core One-Stop partners, others, including Baltimore and Indianapolis, also considered the primary JTPA service provider agencies to be core One-Stop partners.

Additional types of agencies that were local partners in One-Stop centers in only a few sites included local mental health agencies, an organization serving migrant farmworkers, social service organizations, a city health department, and a child care assistance agency.

### Coordination with School-to-Work Initiatives

As described in Exhibit 2-4, a number of the case study sites had collaborated effectively with the local planning groups responsible for the school-to-work initiative by the end of the first year of One-Stop operations. Two sites had particularly strong linkages between One-Stop and school-to-work systems. In Anoka County, Minnesota, the One-Stop center is the administrator of a $650,000 five-year school-to-work implementation grant, received in collaboration with five local independent school districts, a community college, and a technical college. As the hub for school-to-work implementation, the One-Stop center partners will coordinate collection and dissemination of career and labor market information to school-to-work partners. In Connecticut, the regional workforce board responsible for the local One-Stop system containing the New London center is also undertaking a five-year school-

### Exhibit 2-4
### Integrating One-Stop with School-to-Work and Welfare-to-Work Systems

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | *School-to-work.* The New London region began its 5-year federally funded School-to-Work grant in June 1996 as a collaboration between the state's Department of Education and the Regional Workforce Development Board. Under the Workforce Development Board's plan, the One-Stop will act as a "clearing house" for the school system by furnishing career information to schools and providing businesses with a single point for recruiting new workers.<br>*Welfare-to-work.* At the time of the site visits, there was still no formal agreement between the agencies charged with social services and workforce development on delivering welfare-to-work services. |
| Iowa | *Welfare-to-work.* JOBS is the largest single program at the Des Moines Workforce Development Center. The state's welfare reform model (initiated in 1994 under federal waiver authority) is currently the dominant model for enhanced services for center customers. This model—which emphasizes "work first" imposes sanctions on individuals who fail to sign a family investment contract. It offers significant incentives for employment, including transitional cash benefits for the first four months of employment or transitional child care and medical assistance for one year after employment is obtained.<br>*School-to-work.* The Des Moines center has arranged with several area high schools to offer a "Workforce for Teens" career awareness course to young people about to enter the labor market. The course is taught at the center for local high school credit. |
| Indiana | *Welfare-to-work.* In anticipation of federal legislation mandating a welfare-to-work program, the Indianapolis PIC requested and received a grant from the Rockefeller and Mott Foundations to develop creative mechanisms to address the local service needs of welfare-dependent populations. A representative from the welfare-to-work program was scheduled to be outstationed at the Eastside center.<br>*School-to-work.* Staff at the Lawrenceburg center participate in outreach into local high schools and technical schools and communicate with teachers to enhance career education opportunities for students in grades 8 and 9. The center also houses staff responsible for the JTPA Summer Youth Employment Program, as well as a program to provide youth offenders with employment or training opportunities. |

**Exhibit 2-4** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Maryland | *Welfare-to-work.* In Baltimore, welfare recipients are served in specialized centers. Two of these centers are operated by a key One-Stop partner—the Mayor's Office of Economic Development (MOED)—under contract to the county's Department of Social Services. Although housed at different locations than the full-service One-Stops, the specialized welfare-to-work centers are part of an electronic network intended facilitate individual customer referrals between all service sites. CareerNet hardware and software were also being installed in both of these specialized centers during the first phase of Baltimore's One-Stop implementation initiative.<br>*School-to-work.* The Baltimore Career Center Network intends to coordinate with School-to-Work planning teams to develop ways to make the CareerNet technology accessible to youth at the career centers. Youth-related initiatives in Baltimore, which include the JTPA-funded Summer Youth Employment Program, the Youth Fair Chance initiative in East Baltimore, and Baltimore's School-to-Work initiative—called Career Connections—are coordinated at the agency level (e.g., within MOED, which oversees both youth and adult JTPA services), as well as through overlapping memberships on the local School-to-Work advisory board and the Private Industry Council. Integration of youth services with the One-Stop initiative—through the installation of CareerNet automated services at youth service sites and the encouragement of youth to use the full-service career centers—was a high priority for MOED. |
| Minnesota | *Welfare-to-work.* In June 1996, 26 Income Maintenance Department intake staff and 9 Child Care Assistance staff joined as partners of the Workforce Center. They were to be joined in 1997 by the remainder of the approximately 100 Income Maintenance staff working with ongoing cases. The timing of the integration of Income Maintenance and Child Care Assistance staff into the Workforce Center is viewed as particularly appropriate, because new state welfare reform measures stipulate that as of July 1997, all TANF recipients with children aged 3 or over will be required to begin looking for work within ten days after finishing a 30-day group orientation.<br>*School-to-work.* The Workforce Center will administer a $650,000, five-year school-to-work implementation grant, which they received in collaboration with five local independent school districts, a community college, and a technical college. The Workforce Center is to act as the "hub" for Anoka County's school-to-work implementation, serving to bring parties involved in school-to-work together. The Center will also coordinate collection and dissemination of career and labor market information through electronic linkages and written materials. At the time of the evaluation visit, the Workforce Center was in the process of hiring a full-time school-to-work coordinator. |

**Exhibit 2-4** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Texas | *School-to-work.* Workforce boards in Texas have broad-ranging responsibility for school-to-work and welfare-to-work programs. In Arlington, the school district is an active One-Stop partner and currently manages a JTPA contract that tries to get out-of-school youth back into the school system. The district also collaborates with groups such as Arlington Youth Services and the Boys and Girls Club in coordinating school-to-work programs.<br>*Welfare-to-work.* As of May 1996, the Texas Department of Human Services had stationed a full-time JOBS counselor at the Lake Jackson Center. DHS respondents were enthusiastic about the co-location agreement, seeing it as a way to expose welfare customers to the "professional" atmosphere of the Center, and to ease the transition from welfare to work. |
| Wisconsin | *School-to-work.* Partners for Education, an active on-site partner at the Waukesha Center, is charged with creating partnerships between education and business. The center intends to sponsor job fairs and career expos for youth, and is in the process of developing relations with area schools. The center's library has more than 100 titles of "Enter Here" videos on different occupations geared for youth going directly to work after high school, as well as information on four-year colleges and career exploration software for young people.<br>*Welfare-to-work.* Income maintenance workers for all "abled-bodied" individuals are co-located at the center. At the time of the site visit, welfare-to-work services were provided by an on-site service provider under contract to the welfare department. It is expected that the center will continue to be the primary provider of welfare-to-work services under welfare reform. |

to-work project. In collaboration with the state department of education, the One-Stop center will act as a clearinghouse for career information and as a single point of contact for employers seeking new workers.

Although the school-to-work and One-Stop systems were less fully integrated in Waukesha County, Wisconsin, school-to-work and One-Stop funding were carefully coordinated to support the development of a joint Community Career Center, which was designed to serve both youth and adults. In addition, the local One-Stop partnership included a non-profit organization called Partners for Education, which encourages collaboration between One-Stop agency partners, schools, and employers in developing linkages between school and work for young people.

### Coordination with Welfare-to-Work Initiatives

Exhibit 2-4 also summarizes the coordination linkages between One-Stop and welfare-to-work systems. At the time of the site visits, the relationships between welfare-to-work and One-Stop agency partners were in a state of flux as a result of the expected passage of welfare reform block grants. Perhaps the biggest question affecting future local One-Stop partnership development is whether welfare agencies will assume control of welfare-to-work transition services and, if so, whether they will delegate some or all of the responsibility for serving welfare-dependent individuals to the One-Stop service delivery system.

At the time of the site visits, the agency responsible for JTPA or ES/UI was the official operator of welfare-to-work services in six of the 14 case study sites.[1] In another five case study sites, welfare-to-work services were provided on-site at One-Stop career centers by additional local partners.[2]

## GOAL 2. ORGANIZING ONE-STOP CENTERS INTO LOCAL SYSTEMS

To ensure statewide geographic coverage, most states have created a number of different service delivery areas within which to design and implement local One-Stop systems. There is significant variation, however, in how many One-Stop centers are planned for each service delivery area and how One-Stop centers within the same service area relate to each other. There is also significant variation in the extent to which local systems have co-located local service delivery partners at a single One-Stop facility, or, as an alternative, linked multiple service sites electronically to achieve an integrated service delivery system.

---

[1] Des Moines and Creston, Iowa; Baltimore, Maryland; Arlington and Lake Jackson, Texas; and Waukesha, Wisconsin

[2] Springfield, Massachusetts; Anoka County, Minnesota; Indianapolis and Lawrenceburg, Indiana; and Wood County, Ohio.

**Autonomous Centers Versus Interdependent Networks**

Exhibit 2-5 provides examples of how the different case study sites have organized One-Stop centers into local systems. Several of the case study sites were planning to develop only a single One-Stop career center in the sampled service delivery area. For example, the Creston, Iowa, center is planned to be the only full-service center serving a largely rural seven-county area. Similarly, Des Moines is the site of the only planned full-service center in its eight-county service delivery area. To reach customers throughout their service areas, some sites with a single full-service One-Stop center planned to create close coordination linkages (including shared electronic information networks) with additional "satellite" sites maintained by staff from local partner agencies—such as stand-alone offices offering ES and UI services. They also tended to encourage customers to use telephones and computers with modems to access automated information services from off-site locations and visit self-service information kiosks in additional community locations.

The challenge of serving a multi-county service delivery area was addressed in other sites by developing multiple One-Stop career centers. Some sites established several autonomous full-service One-Stop career centers within a single service delivery area.[3]

For example, in the Southeast Connecticut workforce development area, there will eventually be two full-service One-Stop centers. However, even though they will be overseen by the same regional workforce development board and local One-Stop management committee, each center will be responsible for developing its own cadre of local partners, its own menu of services, and its own local management team. Similarly, in the two-county service delivery area containing the Columbia, Maryland, Career Center, each county-level workforce development system has its own planning committee and operates largely independently of the other.

---

[3] Several of these sites also planned additional ways for customers to access One-Stop services, including self-service community locations (for example, in schools or libraries) and on-line access to automated information services from the customer's home or business.

### Exhibit 2-5
### Examples of Organizing One-Stop Service Delivery Systems: Networks, Centers, Satellites

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut<br>*Autonomous Centers with Satellite Service Locations* | Eventually, there will be two full-service One-Stop centers within the Southeast Connecticut service delivery area. Each of these centers will be overseen by the same regional workforce development board and local One-Stop management committee. However, each center will be responsible for developing its own service plan and will have its own day-to-day management structure. Customers may also access automated services at additional community locations. |
| Indiana<br>*Local Network* | The Indianapolis Employment and Training Network (iNET) consists of three One-Stop centers, all of which are operated by the same two core agency partners (the state agency responsible for ES and UI agency and the local JTPA service provider). Services at each center vary somewhat depending on the clientele at each center. For example, the center located closest to many low-income neighborhoods has more on-site and off-site service linkages to programs targeted to economically disadvantaged groups. A regional One-Stop Director convenes the Center managers on a regular basis to facilitate coordination across centers. |
| Iowa<br>*Autonomous Center with Satellite Service Locations* | The Creston Workforce Development Center is the only full-service One-Stop center serving a seven-county largely rural area. Center staff provide workforce development services throughout the region by traveling regularly to satellite or "itinerant" locations hosted by a variety of social service agencies. |
| | The Des Moines Workforce Development Center is the only designated One-Stop center in an 8-county service delivery area. |

**Exhibit 2-5** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Maryland<br>*Local Network with Satellite Service Locations* | The Baltimore One-Stop network combines co-location of staff with the implementation of integrated staff functions and delivery of an integrated menu of services in full-service centers with a "no wrong door" approach that links participating service providers throughout the city. When fully developed, the system will include:<br>• Three *full-service career centers* offering a comprehensive menu of staffed and self-service options, open to the general public as well as individuals qualifying for targeted services.<br>• A number of *specialized centers* offering a more limited set of services. Examples of specialized centers include free-standing Job Service offices with limited ES/UI services, centers specializing in youth services, and centers specializing in services to welfare-dependent families.<br>• A network of satellite "village centers" staffed by community-based organizations that will conduct outreach to residents of targeted low-income neighborhoods, provide counseling on education and employment, and refer interested residents to services available in other network locations.<br>Under the previous system, the Urban League had operated a center serving JTPA Title IIA and dislocated worker participants and the AFL-CIO had operated the local center for dislocated workers. Under the new One-Stop design, each of these contractors will be responsible for managing a full-service center that serves a universal customer population. The Eastside Center, however, is staffed by the JTPA administrative entity. |
| *Autonomous Centers with Satellite Unstaffed Service Locations* | The Columbia Maryland Career Center is one of two planned centers in its two-county service delivery area. Although the state requires a single planning and management team to oversee each SDA, this SDA has formed two planning and management teams (one for each county) and operates two largely independent county-level workforce delivery systems.<br>The local One-Stop system plan calls for the establishment of several additional unstaffed "career information centers" within service sites operated by One-Stop partners. |

**Exhibit 2-5** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Massachusetts<br>*Autonomous Competing Centers* | The FutureWorks Career Center is one of two One-Stop career centers chartered by the Hampden County Regional Employment Board. Hampden County residents may receive services from FutureWorks, located in the City of Springfield, or from CareerPoint, a second One-Stop career center located about six miles away in Holyoke. |
| Minnesota<br>*Autonomous Centers with Satellite Service Locations* | The state requires each of the 17 local service delivery areas to develop a plan for integrating services through Workforce Development Centers. Most service delivery areas will have multiple full-service One-Stop centers as well as satellite centers. |
| Ohio<br>*Autonomous Centers with Satellite Service Locations* | The Lucas and Wood counties service delivery area included two One-Stop centers at the time of the evaluation site visit. Since the time of the site visit, a third center has also received official designation from the state as a One-Stop career center. Additional service sites operated by the various employment, training, and human service agencies and organizations participating in the local One-Stop initiative are also considered part of the local One-Stop system. In the Lucas and Wood County One-Stop system, all core partners are required to out-station staff at the designated One-Stop centers at least part-time. Partners also maintain "home sites" at their own facilities. |
| Texas<br>*Local Network* | The Arlington Career Center is one of seven One-Stop centers in Tarrant County that are administered by two different organizations. A single workforce development board has recently been formed to provide unified policy oversight over what used to be two distinct JTPA service delivery areas. An electronic communications network links all centers and office of the local policy board. The partners in the Tarrant County Career Center network have adopted a flexible network approach to the provision of One-Stop services, with each of the seven full-service Career Centers in the County offering a different configuration of co-located and "no wrong door" linkages to comprehensive services for Center customers.<br>Because the physical facility selected for the Arlington Career Center did not lead to full co-location of multiple agency partners, the One-Stop model that has evolved draws on the combined features of "co-location" and "no-wrong-door" approaches. The service approach emphasizes sharing staff across multiple agencies and local service sites, including part-time and full-time out-stationing of staff from a variety of partner agencies at the Arlington Career Center. |

The Hampden County Regional Employment Board in Massachusetts also created two largely autonomous centers by chartering two different entities to operate "competing" One-Stop career centers within its service delivery area. This is part of an overall strategy for increasing the choices available to local customers by encouraging friendly competition among career center operators. Located only about eight miles from its "sister" career center, the FutureWorks Career Center has differentiated itself from the other center by developing different services oriented to a different clientele.

In contrast to the sites that developed largely autonomous One-Stop centers, several of the local case study sites developed highly interdependent One-Stop networks. The sites that created interdependent One-Stop networks were all located in urbanized areas with a highly diverse customer base. The most striking examples of these networks include the Tarrant County, Texas, system containing the Arlington Career Center; the Indianapolis Employment and Training Network; and the Baltimore Career Center Network.

Some sites established multiple One-Stop service sites to address the different needs of different customer groups. For example, when fully developed, the Baltimore One-Stop network will include:

- Three *full-service career centers* offering a comprehensive menu of staffed and self-service options, open to the general public as well as to individuals qualifying for targeted services.
- A number of *specialized centers* offering a more limited set of services. Examples of specialized centers include free-standing Job Service offices with limited ES and UI services, centers specializing in youth services, and centers specializing in services to welfare-dependent families.
- A network of satellite "village centers" staffed by community-based organizations that will conduct outreach to residents of targeted low-income neighborhoods, provide counseling on education and employment, and refer interested residents to services available in other network locations.

Similarly, each of the three One-Stop centers within the Indianapolis Employment and Training Network vary their service offerings somewhat depending on the clientele at each center. For example, the center located closest to many low-income neighborhoods has more on-site and off-site linkages to programs targeted to economically disadvantaged groups.

Although their services are sometimes differentiated to respond to their specific customers' needs and interests, the different One-Stop centers within interdependent networks usually share a single management structure, or if they have independent management, they share a common service philosophy and guidelines propounded by a shared local system-level policy or advisory board.

### Partners Co-Located in One-Stop Centers

As illustrated in Exhibit 2-6, all but two of the case study sites had staff from four of the five mandatory DOL-funded partners on-site at the One-Stop center on a full-time basis, and most sites also had on-site representation from either a staff member or an intern representing the Title V Senior Community Service Program.

The two exceptions to this pattern were the Arlington (Texas) Career Center and the Wood County (Ohio) Employment Resource Center. In Arlington, facility constraints had prevented the full co-location of the ES/UI and JTPA partners at the time of the site visit. However, one full-time person performing ES and UI duties was housed at the Arlington Career Center during the period of the evaluation visit. The local ES and UI office was located in a separate facility only a block away making ES and UI services readily available to One-Stop career center customers. At the Wood County center, co-location of all mandatory partners was limited to one afternoon a week when all partners outstationed staff at the center to provide information, perform intake, and refer customers to all services provided by local partners. At other times, services provided by the JTPA and welfare-to-work programs were available on-site, while other partners could be reached through referral to or electronic linkages with their home offices.

Beyond the mandatory DOL-funded partners, sites varied in the extent that services from additional partners were available on-site.

- Ten of the 14 sites had arranged for the partners responsible for welfare-to-work services to offer these services at least part-time at the One-Stop center.[4]

---

[4] Elsewhere we have indicated that six ES/UI or JTPA agencies operated welfare-to-work programs directly and that five sites made arrangements for other One-Stop partners to provide welfare-to-work services on-site at One-Stop centers. However, in the Baltimore Career Center Network, the JTPA agency operates welfare-to-work services at three specialized service sites, rather than at the One-Stop centers that serve the general public.

## Exhibit 2-6
## On-Site Partners and Programs

| | ES | UI | JTPA | VETS | Title V | Welfare -to- Work | Voc. Rehab. | ABE/ GED | Income Maint. | Econ. Dev. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New London, CT | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | ✓ |
| Willimantic, CT | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| Creston, IA | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Des Moines, IA | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Indianapolis, IN | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| Lawrenceburg, IN | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Baltimore, MD | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| Columbia, MD | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | |
| Springfield, MA | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | |
| Blaine, MN | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | |
| Bowling Green, OH | * | * | ✓ | * | * | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| Arlington, TX | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | * | * | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| Lake Jackson, TX | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | |
| Pewaukee, WI | ✓ | ** | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ |

* Available on a weekly or "on-call" basis.

** UI claims are taken by telephone in Wisconsin. There is a virtual UI presence because a telephone is available at the One-Stop office to file UI claims.

All on-site partners are listed at the time of site visit in 1996.

- Six of the 14 sites offered ABE/GED classes directly at the One-Stop center. In five of these sites, the provider was a community college or local secondary education entity. In the sixth site, the JTPA provider provided on-site ABE/GED classes for JTPA-eligible customers.
- Five of the 14 sites had arranged for the partners responsible for vocational rehabilitation services to provide these services on-site at the One-Stop center, at least part-time.
- Three of the 14 sites had arranged for the co-location of welfare agency staff responsible for income maintenance and/or supportive services for welfare clients at the One-Stop center.
- Two sites had full-time on-site economic development partners that participated in the delivery of services to employer customers.

Sites that could not arrange for some partners to be co-located on a full-time basis often arranged for periodic visits to the center by staff from additional agency partners. For example, at the New London (Connecticut) center, counselors from local technical colleges and post-secondary schools visited the center on a monthly basis to hold informational sessions and enroll customers in classes. The Arlington (Texas) Career Center schedules staff from the county emergency assistance and older worker programs to be present at the center on a part-time basis. In addition, some centers stationed core ES/UI and JTPA staff on a part-time basis at remote service sites operated by other agencies.

### Coordinated Referrals to Off-Site Partners

Many local sites also developed coordinated referral linkages to supporting partners that were not co-located in the center. Exhibit 2-7 describes the services provided by off-site service providers as well as those provided on-site at selected case study sites. Services available through referral to off-site partners most often included (1) business services offered by community colleges or local economic development agencies, (2) education and training services available from local secondary and post-secondary education and vocational training programs, (3) vocational rehabilitation and welfare-to-work services from partners not co-located at the One-Stop center, and (4) family, health, and social services available from a variety of public and private community agencies.

## Exhibit 2-7
## Examples of On-Site and Off-Site Service Partners

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | At the New London *Connecticut Works* Center, on-site services were provided by staff funded by ES, UI, JTPA, the state economic development agency, and a proprietary service provider that delivers group workshops. Plans were underway for the on-site delivery of support services to welfare-to-work participants by staff from the state Department of Social Services.<br>Off-site services were available to One-Stop customers through coordinated referrals to local school districts, adult education programs, the next-door office of the regional economic development corporation, the Department of Social Service's welfare-to-work contractor, and a education and career telephone "hotline" operated by the State Department of Higher Education.<br>Staff that visited the center on a monthly basis included counselors from local technical colleges and post-secondary schools. |
| Indiana | At the Eastside Indianapolis Career Center, on-site services are provided by staff funded by the ES, UI, and JTPA programs. In addition, several staff provide Veterans Employment Services. A Title V Older Workers program participant serves as the center "hostess."<br>At the Lawrenceburg Workforce Development Center, on-site services are provided by staff funded by ES, UI, JTPA, Title V Older Workers, and the local vocational rehabilitation agency, which stations a representative at the center several days a week. In addition, a full-time ABE/GED instructor teaches classes at the center. |
| Maryland | At the Columbia Career Center, on-site services are provided by staff from the following agencies: the agency responsible for ES and UI, the JTPA administrative entity, a JTPA-funded service provider, and the local community college (evening basic education classes). Customers are assisted in obtaining services off-site from local educational institutions and a business resource center operated by the local economic development agency. |

**Exhibit 2-7** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Minnesota | Services available within the Workforce Center are provided by staff from ES, UI, JTPA, and the division of Rehabilitation Service. Additionally, related services provided by co-located partners within the larger human resources center include sheltered work for individuals with developmental disabilities, ABE/GED services provided by a consortium of six school districts, and counseling on educational opportunities provided by staff from a local educational opportunity center.<br>The Anoka Workforce Center is currently beginning what one respondent described as "the next level of integration" of the welfare system with the workforce development system. In June 1996, 26 Income Maintenance Department intake staff and 9 Child Care Assistance staff joined as partners of the Workforce Center. As soon as a new fourth floor of the Human Service Center is completed in 1997, the remainder of the approximately 100 Income Maintenance staff—those working with ongoing cases—will also be housed within the Workforce Center. |
| Ohio | On-site services include intake, information, and referral on local workforce development programs available from all One-Stop partners, as well as more complete menus of JTPA and welfare-to-work services. An on-site ABE/GED class is provided by a local vocational school. An on-site job club, mandatory for JOBS clients, is also available to the general public.<br>Off-site services include those available from ES and UI (on days the representatives responsible for ES and UI are not present at the center), referral to community-based organizations, and referral to off-site training for categorically eligible customers. |
| Texas | On-site services provided by staff stationed at the center on a full-time basis include JTPA-funded services, ES, UI, welfare-to-work case management, vocational rehabilitation services, as well as adult-basic education classes, ESL classes, and computer and clerical training. Staff stationed at the center on a part-time basis offer county emergency assistance and access to older worker programs. |
| Wisconsin | Services provided by on-site partners include ES, income maintenance, welfare-to-work services, enhanced services to JTPA-eligible customers and welfare recipients, and services to employers, including customized training.<br>The on-site community career center operated by the technical college is designed to serve both youth and adults. |

## GOAL 3. FORMING EFFECTIVE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURES FOR ONE-STOP CENTERS

Given the diverse paths leading to the formation of One-Stop centers, it is not surprising that there is also a diversity of governance and management structures within centers and One-Stop networks. For most of the cases in our sample, however, governance and management of One-Stop centers occurred at three distinct substate levels:

- *Policy and advisory bodies.* In the majority of study sites, policy or advisory bodies were established to oversee the direction of One-Stop centers in local areas.
- *Center and network management.* Centers and networks of One-Stop centers had adopted different approaches to management, ranging from a single administrator to a team management approach.
- *Operations teams.* In many centers, particularly those that were actively integrating services to customers, management staff, supervisors, and front-line staff formed teams or committees focusing on specific aspects of One-Stop operations.

Each of these levels is described below.

### Policy Governance and Advisory Bodies

All local One-Stop systems were governed by some kind of policy or advisory body. These policy bodies often took the form of interagency steering committees for One-Stop systems and comprised agency heads, private businesses, local elected officials, economic development entities, educational institutions and organizations, social services agencies, and other community-based organizations.

As described in the previous chapter on the states' roles, states varied in their guidance about the bodies that should govern local One-Stop systems. Some states allowed sites to use existing governance structures, usually JTPA private industry councils (PICs), as governance boards for local One-Stop systems (although many of these states required the PICs to expand their membership). Other states required that sites establish new governance structures for local One-Stop systems, often referred to as Workforce Development Boards. In many cases, these new boards grew out of local or regional planning committees established during the planning phases of One-Stop implementation to represent all stakeholders in the new system.

In cases where PICs served as the governing bodies for the local One-Stop system, their role was different than the role they played in JTPA. In JTPA, PICs often both provided oversight and delivered services to customers; in the One-Stop system, the boards were encouraged (as in Indiana) or required (as in Texas) to separate their oversight and service delivery roles.

The local and regional governance bodies usually had the following responsibilities: (1) ensuring that local One-Stop centers and One-Stop systems were implemented in accordance with the local and state agreements, (2) ensuring that performance standards were achieved for specific outcomes, (3) overseeing the management of One-Stop systems, (4) assisting in the development of agreements among local partners and approving those agreements, and (5) providing local budget oversight. Some local boards were also responsible for certifying One-Stop centers or "chartering" One-Stop center operators, using criteria established by the state. Examples of the responsibilities of these governing bodies are detailed in Exhibit 2-8; below we describe several examples.

Texas's One-Stop strategy emphasizes local initiative and control in planning and operating One-Stop systems. This strategy is formally codified by state legislation, which established a framework for decentralized planning through local Workforce Development Boards. These boards are to be composed of representatives from workforce development providers as well as business, labor, education, and community-based organizations. Workforce Development Boards, when fully operational, will be responsible for the design and operation of One-Stop centers in service delivery areas that comprise one or more prior JTPA service delivery areas. In areas where they have begun to operate, boards have assumed many of the planning, monitoring, evaluation, and fiscal functions for local workforce programs.

In Massachusetts, which has instituted a competitive model for service delivery, Regional Employment Boards "charter" local One-Stop center operators. These charters are revocable if center operators fail to meet identified performance benchmarks. Center managers and staff work closely with Boards on policy and procedural issues, local economic development initiatives, and efforts to identify emerging community needs and strategies to address these needs. The board responsible for the Springfield One-Stop center was one of the first in the state to engage in a competitive bidding process for operating One-Stop centers, seeking "inventive partners" rather than vendors who would carry out specific pre-defined

## Exhibit 2-8
## Examples of Policy Bodies

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Oversight and administration of career centers are shared by the Regional Workforce Development Boards and the Connecticut Department of Labor (CTDOL).<br>In New London, a management committee is charged with establishing center policy. This committee consists of representatives from the Board, CTDOL, and five other organizations |
| Iowa | Although not in place at the time of the site visits, state legislation has called for the creation of regional advisory boards to (1) advise state agencies and Workforce Development Boards about regional workforce development needs, (2) assist in decisions about the state award of grants or contracts for the delivery of regional workforce development services, and (3) monitor the performance of local service providers. Regional Advisory Board members will be appointed by the governor and will include elected officials as well as business, labor, and education representatives. |
| Indiana | The state of Indiana's plan for policy oversight of local One-Stop systems calls for increased coordination between PICs and local officials, economic development entities, educational institutions and organizations, county-based providers of social services, and other community-based organizations.<br>Because of the Eastside Center's status as a joint state-local pilot project to create a model center, its Advisory Committee consists of public and private sector representatives from both the state and the local level. In Lawrenceburg, no final decision had been made regarding the designation of a governing board at the time of the site visit. |
| Maryland | Baltimore's One-Stop planning team has 14 members. Representatives include the PIC chair and three other employer representatives, Job Service, the Mayor's Office of Employment Development—which is the local administrative entity for the JTPA program—the local community college, the Urban League, and the AFL-CIO. |

**Exhibit 2-8** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Massachusetts | A network of Regional Employment Boards governs and oversees the state's One-Stop career centers. Career centers are responsible to the boards for meeting the terms of their charters, which are revocable if center operators fail to meet identified performance benchmarks. |
| Minnesota | In Anoka County, a local workforce council consists of private-sector, Job Service, rehabilitation services, social services, and local technical and community colleges representatives. In addition, a Human Service Advisory group—consisting representatives of the many agencies that are co-located—holds regular monthly meetings. |
| Texas | The Lake Jackson center is overseen by a regional partnership that includes the administrative entity for a multi-county SDA, the regional Office of the Texas Workforce Commission, and the Houston Regional Office of the Texas Department of Human Services. The Houston-Galveston Area Council acts as the grant recipient and fiscal agent for the partnership. |
| Wisconsin | The state had planned to establish local Human Resource Investment Boards to oversee One-Stop systems, but this proposal met with resistance in Waukesha and other local area because these proposed governing bodies were being planned after local planning teams had been established to manage One-Stops. |

services. The private Employment and Training Institute (ETI) was awarded a charter to operate the Springfield center.

In one study site, Wisconsin's Waukesha County, the proposed creation of a new governance body was met with substantial resistance. Initially, the local One-Stop center was guided by a collaborative planning team that had responsibility over a three-county SDA. The state's planned framework for local One-Stop governance called for establishing local "Human Resource Investment Boards." Representatives from local partner agencies, however, were opposed to what was perceived as another layer of bureaucracy and were concerned about the potential destabilizing effect this mandated structure could have on the current collaborative process, which partners believed worked exceptionally well. In the face of local opposition, the state has postponed establishing these formal local governance boards.

### Center and Network Management

One-Stop partners formed a variety of structures to manage their One-Stop systems. These ranged from having a single director with overall authority for policy and management within a center to shared management of the center among numerous partners. These variations in management structures are discussed below and summarized in Exhibit 2-9.

#### Single Manager

Some centers have a director from a single agency who coordinates all of the activities in the center. For example, the Creston, Iowa, Workforce Development Center is managed by the JTPA director. This director is responsible for overall management of the shared physical facility and day-to-day operations of the center, and serves as the primary liaison between the various state agencies, departments, and programs represented at the center. The director was selected collaboratively with the state's regional Employment Service manager. Further, the director coordinates closely with the Employment Service office manager in administering the center's day-to-day functions.

Many sites with a single director found that establishing an interagency management workgroup, composed of members from several agencies, promoted a cohesive service delivery structure. These interagency management teams provided a forum for joint planning and resolution of issues, including problems in sharing space and equipment, working out staff duties and schedules, and how to best coordinate

## Exhibit 2-9
## Examples of One-Stop Center Management Structures

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | In all centers in the state, the Job Center director has been designated the director for the entire One-Stop center, although there is still a clear division of management responsibility for center operations by categorical programs and funding streams. |
| Iowa | The Creston Center is managed by the SDA director, who coordinates with the Job Service office manager in administering the Center's day-to-day functions.<br>At the Des Moines center, the "partner's group" includes senior staff from all eight core partners at the center and is responsible for joint administration of the Center. |
| Indiana | In Indianapolis, the day-to-day operation of each center is co-managed by a "partnership of equals" of the Department of Workforce Development (which is responsible for UI and ES services) and PIC contractor, which is responsible for JTPA services. |
| Maryland | In Baltimore day-to-day management and operation of the Center are the responsibility of the two co-located partners, JTPA and Job Service, although responsibility for the self-service equipment resides with the Job Service, who occupied the center before being joined by the JTPA unit. |
| Massachusetts | The FutureWorks center in Springfield is managed by an executive director, who is assisted by a management team that includes managers of the center's four functional divisions. |
| Minnesota | Day-to-day governance of the Workforce Center in Anoka County is provided by a steering committee that directs, coordinates, and oversees center operations. The steering committee is co-chaired by the directors of four agencies within the center. |
| Ohio | Co-managers from the Wood County Department of Human Services and the Toledo Area PIC are responsible for day-to-day management and operations of the Wood County center. |

**Exhibit 2-9** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Texas | After the Arlington Job Training Center was established as a One-Stop Career Center, governance functions were assumed by a "Site-Based Management Committee," which is currently chaired an employee of county's JTPA administrator. This committee, comprised of 24 committee members and 15 ex-officio members, includes broad representation from on-site service providers and other agencies participating in local One-Stop planning and policy development. |
| Wisconsin | The Waukesha center is guided by a collaborative planning team that consists of Job Service, the PIC, the administrative entity for the JOBS program, and the local technical college. The day-to-day operation is overseen by a management team consisting of top-level representatives from six of the key partner agencies at the center. |

services to individuals and employers. For example, in Lake Jackson, Texas, the center formed a management team that included the center manager; supervisors for UI, ES, JTPA, and JOBS; and the local Veterans Employment Services representative. This committee was jointly responsible for day-to-day administration, staffing, and scheduling. In Arlington, Texas, a site-based management committee met on a regular basis to coordinate center activities, share information on service provision, and establish long-range planning goals for the center.

#### Dual Managers

In some cases, partly to avoid the perception that there was one "lead" agency, representatives of two key partners were designated co-managers. For example, in Indianapolis, each center within the city's network was co-managed by designated staff from the two agencies responsible for UI/ES services and JTPA services as a "partnership of equals."

The co-managers in the Wood County, Ohio, One-Stop center were the directors of the welfare-to-work agency and the JTPA agency. These co-managers jointly oversaw the scheduling and operation of the center, assisted in resolving conflicts among partners, and carried out the action plans approved by the center's governance council. Each co-manager also had specific responsibilities. The welfare-to-work co-manager chaired the center's interagency team while the JTPA co-manager was in charge of the financial aspects of the center.

#### Team Management

In other cases, no one person had overall management authority for the center; rather management and oversight was conducted by a committee of partners, each of whom was also individually responsible to their respective agency for program-related duties.

In Anoka County, Minnesota, for example, day-to-day management of the center was provided by a steering committee that directed, coordinated, and oversaw center operations. The steering committee was co-chaired by the directors of four agencies within the Center: JTPA, ES/UI, Rehabilitation Services, and the county's income maintenance division. Meetings of the steering committee, which were held every three weeks, were attended by about twenty supervisory staff and directors from all agency partners at the center. The steering committee made recommendations to its Workforce Council on issues of service improvement, provided input in the preparation of the center's budgets and service coordination plans, oversaw customer satisfaction and outcome measurement, and maintained ongoing communication with front-line staff on a variety of policy, funding, and operational issues.

The One-Stop center in Des Moines, Iowa, was also managed by an interagency team. This team provided the administrative structure for the consolidation of core services. Management functions were shared among senior staff from each of the eight core agencies that belonged to the "partner's group" at the center.

### Operations Teams

To facilitate coordination, most One-Stop centers formed operations teams to develop operational procedures for the center (see Exhibit 2-10). In some cases, these teams were formed to conduct a specific task. Such teams were common in the planning period, as centers needed to develop new collaborative procedures to conduct their business. In some sites, however, task-specific teams continued to be formed whenever a new issue arose that needed a coordinated resolution.

For example, at the Eastside Baltimore Career Center, one operational team was charged with planning for the development of a resource library. In Springfield, Massachusetts, a "career development" team coordinated with resource room staff to identify providers of training for specific career areas. Staff in Waukesha, Wisconsin, formed an interagency workgroup to address problems that employers were having in finding a pool of qualified apprenticeship applicants.

Many One-Stop centers also established on-going operational committees with responsibilities for coordinating specific operations. For example, at Anoka County's Workforce Center several "operations committees," composed of front-line and supervisory staff, have been formed to coordinate the various common service functions, including intake, information services, assessment and career planning, job search, training, and case management. In Willimantic, Connecticut, a work team composed of local front-line staff meets regularly to coordinate scheduling, and another team, composed of counselors from different partner agencies, meets to coordinate assessment for customers from a variety of backgrounds. In Springfield, Massachusetts, a "No Excuses" team was charged with improving the customer focus of services and using customer feedback in its continuous feedback process.

## Exhibit 2-10
## Examples of Operations Teams

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | In Willimantic, there are a number of committees and work teams comprised of local front-line staff. These teams meet to share ideas on improving the integration and delivery of services to customers. Two of the most active committees are a Workshop Committee, which decides what workshops will be offered at the Center, and an Assessment Team, which coordinates assessment methods. |
| Iowa | The Creston Center is relatively small so all staff attend weekly planning meetings to increase their familiarity with the range of services offered at the center as well as off-site.<br>In Des Moines, inter-agency groups include a customer service and an assessment committee, both of which are charged with furthering the integration of services to individuals. |
| Indiana | At the Indianapolis Eastside Center, two cross-agency functional units are responsible for services for individual customers: reception and intake and skills identification and development. |
| Maryland | At the Eastside Baltimore Center, one interagency operations team was developing plans for the resource library. |
| Massachusetts | In the Springfield center, the Career Development team coordinates with another team, Community Relations, to identify providers of training for specific career areas. Other specialized work teams are formed as needed to develop or improve services to individuals. |
| Minnesota | Interagency committees, consisting of front-line and supervisory staff, coordinate all common service functions, including intake, assessment and career planning, job search, training, case management, and universal services. |
| Texas | In Arlington, teams of front-line staff meet regularly to discuss current service practices across partner agencies and opportunities for improved coordination or integration of services. |
| Wisconsin | An "Integrated Services to Job Seekers" Committee is one of a variety of interagency committees that has been formed at the Waukesha Center. This committee is responsible for coordinating all services to individuals. |

### GOAL 4. STAFFING ONE-STOP CENTERS TO FACILITATE SERVICE COORDINATION

Centers also needed to develop staffing arrangements that supported the One-Stop approach. As shown in Exhibits 2-11 and 2-12, centers adopted several different approaches to coordinating staffing arrangements.

Some sites integrated staff for the reception desk and perhaps the resource area, but maintained separate staffing of all other functions. Partners in these centers provided cross-training to staff about each other's programs to facilitate referrals, but the separate programs continued to operate independently.

For example, the center in Lake Jackson, Texas, adopted a "coordination rather than consolidation" approach to staffing. Although the ES and UI functions had been integrated prior to the One-Stop initiative, JTPA services—also provided by Texas Workforce Commission staff under contract to the local PIC—were delivered by staff assigned to a separate career services unit.

Other centers integrated service staff to a far greater extent. These centers developed functional groups that were cross-staffed by staff from partner agencies. These work teams served customers from many different programs in services that were common to those programs.

For example, several years before the One-Stop initiative, staff at the center in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, suggested that the office be organized by job function rather than by individual program. They identified that most partner programs had job functions for reception, assessment, case management, job development, and employer services; and so they organized functional teams in each of these areas. The development of integrated staff assignments has evolved gradually over time and has been facilitated by the long job tenure of most center staff.

In sites where the majority of staff worked for one agency or organization, functional staffing was not very difficult, involving only cross-training. For example, at Baltimore's Eastside Center, most of the 30 staff are employees of the Mayor's Office of Employment Development, who are joined by three staff from the Employment Service. It was relatively easy to reorganize staff into several functional units that included a clerical pool, a program development unit, an employment development unit, a job service unit, and a customer services unit.

## Exhibit 2-11
## Approaches to the Integration of One-Stop Services

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | At the New London *Connecticut Works* Center, the agency responsible for ES and UI and JTPA partners share in the staffing of customer reception services and the supervision of self-access services in the career services center and the resource library. Core services to business customers are cross-staffed by employees of the ES/UI and JTPA agencies. Enhanced services to business customers will be shared by these core partners as well as staff out-stationed from the state department of economic development. |
| Indiana | At the Eastside Indianapolis Workforce Development Center, staff have been cross-trained to provide a range of services and to be flexible in carrying out their duties. The goal of the Center is to provide "seamless" services to customers. Rather than being organized according to their categorical program or agency affiliation, Center staff are organized into three cross-agency and cross-program functional units: customer reception and intake, skills identification and development, and employer relations and placement.<br>Although Center staff each receive formal supervision from the manager of their own program (JTPA, ES, or UI), integrated planning and coordination of Center services takes place on a regular basis. Cross-functional teams from JTPA, ES, and UI programs meet regularly to work on ways to improve customer service, assisted in this by a supervisor who acts as facilitator. |
| Iowa | Although there is increasing coordination between staff of partner agencies in the Creston center, the only functions that have been integrated to date are customer reception, the management of the consolidated physical facility, and the provision of self-service automated information and training services in the Resource Room. With the exception of the reception staff and an administrative assistant/MIS liaison, both of whom are engaged in Center-wide operations, staff have not been cross-trained or assigned to perform integrated job functions across programs. |
| | In response to the federal goal of *Integrated Services*, the core partners in the Des Moines WDC are currently working on plans to integrate the common functions of customer reception, testing/assessment, job placement, and employer services. The integration of these functions is viewed as a strategy to reduce duplication of effort across partners. |

**Exhibit 2-11** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Maryland | At the Eastside Career Center, the local JTPA staff have invited their ES and UI partners to join Center operations through selective co-location of staff and participation in an integrated interagency service design process and the development of an integrated staffing plan for the delivery of services to Center customers. This strategy has resulted in the development of additional One-Stop services, including a redesigned Information Session, locally-initiated computer-assisted training options, a series of cross-staffed workshops and seminars for job-seeker customers, and the beginnings of a consolidated system of account executives and services oriented to the needs of employer customers. |
| | At the Columbia Career Center, the automated *CareerNet* system offers high-quality, integrated core services to all system users, irrespective of their eligibility for categorical programs. Beyond these core services, the achievement of the federal objective of *Integrated Services* is currently predicated upon generally informal cooperation and coordination among primary and other partner entities. Customers eligible for categorical programs are referred to the partner entity best suited to provide needed services. |
| Massachusetts | Because it has been fashioned "of a whole cloth," rather than piecemeal, the Center has been immune to the culture clash commonly experienced by staff in One-Stop Centers formed through the consolidation of multiple public agencies and departments. Although the internal organization of services provided by ETI at the FutureWorks Career Center follows a fully-integrated design, not all public workforce development funds were reallocated nor all categorical program responsibilities reassigned to the One-Stop career centers. The most notable program/funding streams not yet consolidated into One-Stop career center operations at the state level are JTPA Title II funds for services to economically disadvantaged individuals and Title III funds for dislocated worker services. |
| Minnesota | The Anoka County approach to consolidation and integration of One-Stop services tends to maintain a clear "division of labor" among programs, so that individual agencies are still responsible for certain functions. Cross-agency planning and oversight committees ensure that the overall service system is coordinated by providing the opportunity for all partners to have substantial input into the design and participate in the oversight of these various functions. |

**Exhibit 2-11** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | At the Wood County Employment Resource Center, partners have emphasized the importance of referring customers to the appropriate agency or organization. Part-time co-location is viewed as a tool to ensure that appropriate referrals are made as well as an opportunity to provide direct customer services. Representatives of all the mandatory programs are on-site at least once a week—on Wednesdays for a minimum of four hours; on other weekdays they may be contacted for appointments at their home sites. Representatives of additional non-mandatory program partners also visit the One-Stop site, but less frequently. They may also be reached at their home sites for appointments.<br>Mandatory and other partners serving customers at both ERCs have been cross-trained. This allows them to assist customers in accessing One-Stop information services, to understand more about the eligibility requirements for their partner agencies, and to make good referrals. |
| Texas | Service integration among Center partners who are not co-located is expressed through close coordination of activities among partners, resulting in personalized services to Center customers. In general, physical proximity allows for frequent face-to-face and telephone contact between staff of the Arlington Center and nearby ES and UI staff, and for coordination of services on behalf of individual customers. Among staff co-housed at the Arlington Center, while cross-training among staff from different agencies is still in an early stage, there are plans to cross-train staff to facilitate integration of core services and case management functions. |
| Wisconsin | As stated in a memorandum of understanding that was signed by the partner agencies nearly two years before the facility was operational, each agency agreed to take the lead on a different specialized function within the Center. This agreement has fostered a sense of cohesion and partnership, while acknowledging and capitalizing on specific expertise and minimizing duplicative efforts. |

## Exhibit 2-12
## Examples of Staffing One-Stop Centers

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Many of the Center's services targeted to all customers are cross-staffed, although categorically-funded programs are not. |
| Iowa | At the Creston center, job assignments follow programmatic, rather than functional, lines. Except for the receptionist and an administrative assistant, both of whom are engaged in center-wide operations, staff have not been cross-trained or assigned to perform integrated job functions across programs. |
| Indiana | In Indianapolis current staff assignments focus on duties that cut across program lines and stress the functional competencies that the various programs have in common. ES and UI staff, who have been cross-trained, are often rotated throughout most of the front-line office positions, including reception and intake, UI claims taking, and job matching.<br>In Lawrenceburg, staff are organized by job function. All staff rotate in front-line positions and staff keep track of which programs they are working on so that they can bill their hours to the correct program. |
| Maryland | At Baltimore's Eastside Center, all staff share a number of common One-Stop staff assignments, in addition to their particular job duties. The integrated staff assignments, shared among all center staff, include: (1) helping customers in the resource room use the automated services and other resource materials, (2) teaching the center's group workshops and seminars, and (3) leading orientation sessions for new customers.<br>Specialized functional units include a clerical pool, a program development unit, an employment development unit, the job service unit, and a customer services unit.<br>In Columbia, ES/UI and JTPA employees are located on separate sides of the center with each performing different functions. No cross-staffing has occurred. |
| Massachusetts | In the FutureWorks Career Center, all staff are assigned to one of four functional divisions: career development services, employer services, MIS/administrative services, and community relations and marketing. |

**Exhibit 2-12** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Minnesota | Integration efforts have been focused on core agency practices in six major areas: intake, assessment and career planning, job search, training, case management, and employer services. Not all of these functions are cross-staffed by employees of the different agencies, however. |
| Ohio | In Wood County, at each of the One-Stop centers, ES and UI representatives have been cross-trained to assist customers in both of these programs. |
| Texas | In Lake Jackson, the ES and UI functions were integrated prior to the One-Stop initiative. The VETS program, although also administered by the Texas Workforce Commission, continues to be staffed separately from ES and UI functions. Under a "coordination rather than consolidation" approach services, JTPA services delivered through a separate career services unit. |
| Wisconsin | At the Waukasha Workforce Development Center, staff are situated in the building based upon function, so that "case management" staff are located in the same area, regardless of agency affiliation. |

In centers involving a greater diversity of partners, however, coordinating and integrating staff functions was a more complex task. Partners needed to develop procedures to allow staff from different agencies to do similar work. Some centers developed consolidated job descriptions to reflect new work teams. For example, the center in Indianapolis developed common job descriptions for staff who worked in joint teams. This process involved negotiating with the unions about the specific job duties of the teams and the appropriate salary levels. Because the job descriptions were broader, the union was concerned that greater expertise was required and that salaries should therefore be higher.

Other centers retained the previous job descriptions and work rules from the separate programs. Although this required less initial investment, it frequently resulted in inconsistencies and some inequities within teams. In some cases, staff working in the same team but employed by different agencies had different job descriptions, salaries, holidays, and work hours.

Integrated work teams also posed a challenge in supervising staff employed by different agencies. To solve this problem, a few centers drew a distinction between "formal" and "functional" lines of supervisory authority. For example, in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, managers from all participating agencies entered into a written contract stating that managers from each agency retained formal supervisory responsibility for the individuals employed by each agency, but allowing individuals from other agencies to provide functional supervision of staff.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND NEXT STEPS

As detailed in this chapter, One-Stop partnerships grew out of varied histories of collaboration among local workforce development partners. In general, centers in which local partners had a longer history of collaboration were much more likely to have developed arrangements for integrating or consolidating common service functions. Many sites, for example, profited greatly from previous experiences in coordinating JTPA, ES, and UI services as well as from existing partnerships with local education, social service, and community organizations.

Many centers have succeeded in achieving co-location—and in several cases, service consolidation—across a broad range of both core and supporting One-Stop partners. Important supporting partners—beyond the mandatory DOL-funded program partners—have often included community and technical colleges, secondary educational institutions, vocational rehabilitation agencies, income maintenance providers, economic development agencies, and community-based service organizations.

Case study sites used a wide variety of organizational approaches to link One-Stop partner agencies into coherent local service systems. One approach, used successfully by sites that could locate and afford to build or refurbish appropriate integrated facilities, was the development of full-service One-Stop centers that permitted the co-location of multiple local partners. Local sites that achieved full co-location were often able to develop consolidated service functions, ranging from reception, intake, and the delivery of self-access services to more intensive services targeted to customers requiring additional assistance. Another approach, used by a number of sites, combined partial or part-time co-location of a staff from multiple One-Stop partners with the creation of coordinated system-level and client-level communication linkages to facilitate the coordination of services provided by local network partners from different service sites.

Policy and advisory bodies, both those that developed as a result of local planning for One-Stop and those mandated by states, also played an important role at all of the One-Stops in our sample. In many cases, local PICs or their successor workforce boards offered substantial input both in terms of establishing local One-Stop policies and providing broad oversight of One-Stop system operations. However, in some local areas (as noted above) the managers of local service delivery partners that had already negotiated One-Stop services and operational procedures viewed policy boards as an unnecessary new layer of bureaucracy.

Management structures for the day-to-day operation of One-Stop centers varied widely, from single center directors to participatory consensus-based management teams. Particularly in One-Stops with many core partners, the team management approach had the advantage of allowing partners to share responsibility for One-Stop operations. In smaller centers, or those with fewer core partners, having a single director was often viewed as the most efficient management strategy.

To address ongoing operational issues, several One-Stop centers formed operational teams that comprised both front-line and supervisory staff. These interagency teams helped shape One-Stop center policies and service designs for shared functions such as self-access services, resource areas, and job placement services, as well as shared enhanced services such as assessment, counseling, and case management.

The One-Stop system will be faced with continuing challenges in promoting effective local partnership development and governance. Each One-Stop center and system appears to have developed staffing, partnering, and management arrangements that suited its local context and furthered its immediate One-Stop goals. However, as they mature and gain additional experience with collaborative service models, many of the study sites are attempting to forge broader and more effective relationships with a variety of partner organizations, particularly education and social service providers. They also are realizing the importance of coordinating One-Stop system-building efforts with related initiatives, such as welfare-to-work and school-to-work, so as to avoid duplication of effort.

# SECTION C
# BUILDING THE INFRASTRUCTURE TO SUPPORT ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

# 3. DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE PHYSICAL FACILITIES FOR ONE-STOP OPERATIONS

## INTRODUCTION

One of the most challenging tasks for states and case study sites was designing and developing the physical facilities to house One-Stop operations. In most cases center development involved co-locating multiple partners operating out of different locations, as well as collaboratively planning for the integration of a range of One-Stop functions such as intake, assessment, and on-site training. Even in One-Stop systems that were not pursuing complete co-location and consolidation of partner operations, a transformed physical facility was a key factor in achieving the One-Stop goals of customer-friendly services, availability of self-service options, and increased ease of employer access.

## GOALS OF CREATING APPROPRIATE PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Case study sites were aware that the physical sites and facilities that housed One-Stop centers would be tangible evidence of how states and local areas had realized their One-Stop visions. Although these visions varied, the federal goals of universality, integration and customer choice led most case study sites to embrace a set of common goals in the development of their physical facilities:

- Providing state support for the development of appropriate facilities.
- Accommodate the co-location of One-Stop partners.
- Design facilities that support integrated staffing and service provision.
- Design facilities that are professional, attractive and "user friendly."
- Design centers that are accessible to customer groups with special needs.

This chapter discusses the range of activities and strategies used by case study sites to shape their physical sites in accordance with these goals.

## GOAL 1. PROVIDING STATE SUPPORT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF APPROPRIATE FACILITIES

States and local areas had different roles in developing physical facilities for the One-Stop initiative. Although all the case study states wanted the state to have a role that facilitated center development, the states varied considerably in what they perceived their proper roles to be.

For some states, having an important role in local facility development was a relatively new experience. However, a number of states, determined to reduce duplication of workforce development services and apply cost-cutting measures, had already been directly involved in merging the facilities of several key One-Stop actors when their One-Stop Implementation Grant funding was approved. Beginning in the early 1990s, for example, the state of Minnesota was concerned with consolidating leases and requiring co-location of DOL-funded programs as their leases expired.

States varied substantially in the extent to which they gave explicit guidance to local areas on the design of One-Stop facilities. A few states were very prescriptive in how decisions were to be made regarding each step of the site-selection and development process. For example, Connecticut developed a "One Stop Model Office Plan," which outlines specific steps in leasing a building and requires certain design features for One-Stop centers. Connecticut state staff emphasized to local areas the importance of redesigning the physical space and traffic flow within career centers so that the physical facility can reinforce the sense that the customer has the initiative to choose the content, delivery mode, and sequencing of services.

The state of Minnesota also used a prescriptive approach, in combination with a comprehensive process of consulting with local partners. In the interests of lowering rents and equipment costs, the state encourages sharing costs with other partners and requires co-location of agencies when their existing leases expire. Minnesota also recommends that local areas develop mobile outreach mechanisms in rural communities, choose facilities that allow One-Stop centers to be open evenings and weekends, and take steps to be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. The state also requires that customer records be available electronically from any One-Stop location.

At the other end of the scale, a few states largely left the design of One-Stop facilities up to local areas. Maryland, for example, determined that it would not "dictate" to local sites, reasoning that existing leases, the availability of local space, and local budgets were the primary factors that would influence the development of One-Stop facilities.

Most other states fell in between these two extremes in how they guided facility development. These states provided relatively broad guidelines and left most aspects of the design of facilities to the discretion of entities at the local level. In Texas, for example, state guidance consisted largely of state staff meetings with local planners to make suggestions regarding space utilization and design. In Indiana, state staff monitor the appearance of One-Stop centers during annual site visits and gather information about how satisfied customers are with center appearance.

Three types of state policies indirectly influenced the design of One-Stop facilities:

- *Which services are required.* Many states require that One-Stop centers provide certain services; these requirements often impacted local areas' facilities designs. For example, Indiana mandated that certain kinds of self-access information be available in One-Stop centers, making it necessary for local areas to create space for these services.
- *Which agencies should be co-located at One-Stop Centers.* Some states required that DOL-funded partners be co-located or occupy contiguous spaces, and that the floor plan be functionally designed to encourage opportunities for team building and partnering.
- *How implementation grant funds could be used.* States encouraged local areas to use their grant funds for one-time system-transformation projects for which no other funds were available. In Minnesota, implementation grant funds could be used for facility-related expenses that consisted of initial co-location, remodeling related to complying with federal ADA requirements, and purchasing compatible phone systems.

Although the effects of most state polices were to facilitate development of integrated One-Stop facilities, state policies prohibiting "buy outs" of existing leases mitigated against effective local site development. The need to work with existing leases often hindered local sites in integrating facilities to the extent they would have liked.

## GOAL 2. ACCOMMODATING THE CO-LOCATION OF ONE-STOP PARTNERS

Most states and local sites were committed to the principle of co-locating key partners in One-Stop centers. Staff believed that physical proximity of programs and agencies not only benefited customers—by making services seamless and convenient to access—but also benefited staff by making it easier to coordinate activities and to cross-train staff in other programs.

A few sites were able to accommodate all or most partners' offices either in the same building or in the same "campus" area. The following two cases exemplify this approach.

Planners and staff for the Workforce Center of Anoka County were able to locate their center on the "campus" of the Human Services Center, located on ten well-landscaped acres. Reasonable rent and several floors of space contributed to the relative ease of co-location of six major partner agencies, and enabled a total of forty agencies to be located within the complex. Key One-Stop partners include the mandated workforce development programs as well as county agencies representing welfare, social services, and mental health programs. Although Anoka County received Implementation Grant funding to assist with remodeling costs, the physical facility also was supported by many other funding sources. Funding providers included the City of Blaine, which donated the land; United Way of Minneapolis, which contributed $500,000 over five years for program operations; and the McKnight Foundation, which assisted agencies with relocating to the center. Because the building is publicly owned, rental costs are lower than in comparable commercial sites.

Wisconsin's Waukesha County Workforce Development Center is a second example of extensive co-location. The center's key partner agencies, each representing major funding streams, had been working collaboratively for several years prior to the opening of the center in 1995. The center is situated on the campus of the Waukesha County Technical College, at a site designed specifically to house the One-Stop center. The basic partnership for providing coordinated services consists of the Wisconsin Job Service, the Private Industry Council, county agencies concerned with health and human services and economic development, and the local technical college. Other local agency partners providing specialized services to targeted populations are also located at the center. The Workforce Development Center facility was built with funds from the local Technical College. Partners share facilities costs through lease agreements with a third party foundation, which holds title to the facility. Additional funding was received through the One-Stop Implementation grant and a One-Stop Local learning Laboratory grant.

More commonly, sites began by co-locating some agencies—usually DOL-funded programs—and developing alternative ways for allowing these core agencies to collaborate with other partners.

In some cases, partners whose main business location was elsewhere were able to outstation a staff member at the One-Stop center, usually for several days a week. For example, at the Columbia (Maryland) Employment and Training Center, core partners are co-located in a small strip mall and jointly manage a center that houses the ES and UI staff, and the county JTPA unit. Two additional coordinating partners, the local community college and the Business Resource Center, have their main offices elsewhere, but provide workshops for One-Stop center customers in a classroom space in the same mall as the One-Stop center.

Other sites co-located key partners and developed electronic linkages with other partners. Several local sites, including the Arlington Career Center in Texas, were unable to find a facility large enough to incorporate all local One-Stop partners. In these cases, on-site co-located key partners are supported by staff from agencies linked electronically to the centers, and as well as staff available on-site on a part time or "as-needed" basis. For example, in Arlington, the career center housed predominately JTPA-funded staff. However the center was located within a block of the local ES and UI center office, whose veterans employment services staff made themselves available "on call" to customers at the One-Stop center. In addition, an ES/UI staff member was out-stationed at the center during the period of review.

Most sites faced a variety of barriers to achieving the desired level of co-location and as a result had to compromise as they developed their physical facilities. These barriers included the following:

- *Constraints created by existing leases.* Leases with several years left, particularly in those states which had a policy of no lease buy-outs, often prevented key partners from moving to a more suitable shared facility; in these cases, remodeling adjacent spaces (e.g., removing a wall) was sometimes an interim solution. In one site, however, the JTPA agency was able to "swap" its existing lease with another federal agency, so that it could relocate to the building occupied by the Employment Service.
- *Constraints of site availability.* For those sites seeking a new location, an important consideration was finding buildings large enough to accommodate all partners wishing to co-locate initially and for those

wishing to relocate at a later date. The space needed to be flexible enough to accommodate resource libraries, orientations, mass employer recruitment situations, or Job Fairs. Often, during the first year of operations, such space had not been found. Some sites, therefore, adopted a "make do for now" attitude.

- *Constraints of existing space*. In some sites, the limitations of existing or available facilities made integration of the spaces occupied by side-by-side partners a difficult goal to achieve. For example, in Columbia, Maryland, center planners attempted to reengineer existing space to accommodate partners' needs. But working around an existing structure posed formidable problems in arranging an attractive and customer-responsive facility. As a result, in Columbia, JTPA staff are located on the opposite side of the facility from ES and UI staff, which is not conducive to shared service functions.
- *Limited budgets*. Budget limitations also influenced site selection and physical accommodations, particularly where local sites had little funding support except that which was provided by states through their Implementation Grant funds. Sites with additional funding sources were able to develop sites that better met the goals of integrated service delivery.

## GOAL 3. DESIGNING FACILITIES THAT SUPPORT INTEGRATED STAFFING AND SERVICE PROVISION

Once decisions were made about the site (i.e., moving to a new facility or remodeling an existing one), the next step was determining how to configure the available space to facilitate the integration of staff and services. Centers developed or modified their facilities in the following areas: (1) the "entry" space or reception area, (2) resource and information areas, (3) shared office space, and (4) other shared space, including conference rooms and classrooms. Approaches to configuring each of these areas are described below.

### Reception Areas

All the centers had an integrated reception area. These areas were usually located immediately at the entrance and were furnished with a desk, at which the receptionist sat, and seating for customers who were waiting for services. This arrangement allowed a single staff person, usually funded by multiple agencies, to help customers reach the appropriate services and begin the preliminary eligibility determination process.

Many centers have designed reception areas in which staff can make good use of their time until staffed services become available. No longer required to "take a number and wait," customers in most centers can interact immediately with knowledgeable staff. If required to wait for services, customers usually had access to materials to orient them to the center so that they could make productive use of their time while waiting.

For example, some One-Stops centers have equipped their reception areas with television monitors on which customers can watch videos presenting information about the center's services. Others made written materials available in the reception areas. At the Lawrenceburg Workforce Development Center in Indiana, customers waiting for services can view instructional videos, including an introduction to work readiness skills, job search techniques and interviewing tips. Customers have a choice of sitting in chairs near a window or at round tables well-stocked with magazines and publications.

### Resource and Information Areas

Most centers established space to house integrated resource rooms, in which customers can use self-access information and training services. Information and resource areas in some centers are equipped with semi-private work station "cubicles," equipped with computer terminals. Often resource areas include monitors so that customers can view informational videos. Centers also made space available in their resource areas for a staff member or "librarian," who can help customers.

For example, Baltimore's Eastside Center's two-room "resource area" is equipped with terminals in work stations, which customers can use to access labor market information and job listings. Copy and fax machines are another important feature available to customers in resource rooms in a number of sites.

### Staff Offices

Many centers have arranged staff offices so that staff performing the same function are located together, regardless of which agency or program pays their salary. Grouping offices by function also allows centers to consolidate staff that need special types of space.

At some centers, staff office areas are in plain view to emphasize their accessibility and facilitate interactions among staff from different programs. For example, at the FutureWorks Center in Massachusetts, the most visible office is that of the center director who makes herself available to individual and employer customers. At the Columbia Maryland site, most staff have low walls to provide an atmosphere of openness. At the Indiana Eastside Center, staff are intermingled in an area where only managers have doors to their offices.

### Shared Conference and Classroom Areas

Most centers also contained areas, such as classrooms and conference rooms, that are shared by all center partners. For example, the center in Waukesha, Wisconsin, has a large number of shared spaces: rooms in which staff can conduct training and group activities; conference rooms in which to hold staff meetings; and a space jointly used for mailing, copying and other administrative functions.

Similarly, Baltimore's Eastside Center has four classrooms and conference rooms in which partners can hold classes or workshops, and where employers can conduct interviews. Equipment such as faxes and copiers are also identified as shared resources and are available to all partners.

As illustrated by the examples above, many One-Stop centers have configured their spaces to emphasize that the center has a unified approach to serving customers. However, other One-Stop centers' goals for configuring space to accommodate integrated services were not always attainable, particularly during the first year when existing facility leases and reduced program budgets constrained them from making all the changes that they desired.

## GOAL 4. DESIGNING FACILITIES THAT ARE PROFESSIONAL, ATTRACTIVE, AND "USER-FRIENDLY"

One major goal for One-Stop planners was to design the centers to make them more attractive and inviting to their customers. In many centers, customers reported that the previous facilities were dingy and crowded, with bank-teller type windows and long lines that wasted the customers' time. The objective of most sites, therefore, was to design interior space with an atmosphere conducive to improving the capability of customers to "get what they came for," to give them a feeling of dignity, and to help them make good use of their time while at the center.

Several features of the One-Stop center that facilitated integrated services, described above, also contributed to improving the attractiveness of the centers. In most centers, the atmosphere of reception centers was far more attractive and business-like than that of the previous waiting areas. The resource area in many centers is also designed to look like a business office. As described above, some centers have designed information resource areas with work stations and cubicles. Office equipment, such as faxes, copiers, and printers are placed in visible areas. One-Stop staff have indicated that making the resource area business-like has significantly increased its use by the general public.

Some sites determined that their center's attractiveness was also affected by the amount of space devoted to service functions. As a result, they increased the amount of center space devoted to use by customers, including both individuals and employers. Designing areas that ensured customers' privacy also contributed to the business-like nature of the centers. For example, in the Eastside Workforce Development Center in Indiana, the resource area is furnished with work station cubicles, giving customers privacy while working at the computer terminals or researching information.

Employers also benefited from designers' attempts to make center sites more attractive and professional. For example, staff indicated that New London's new attractive site attracted employers; at their previous site, employers "would not come near the place." In one site, employers have a separate entrance and reception area. Wherever possible, designing the exterior area to be more attractive was an important part of improving the center "image." For example, Anoka County's Workforce Center is located within a well-landscaped area of an attractive complex of buildings, and the New London Center in Connecticut is located in an attractive mall.

A member of the staff at the Waukesha County Workforce Development Center in Wisconsin said that they "expect the center to be viewed as a professional entity dedicated to comprehensive, high-quality workforce development needs for all individuals and employers, rather than as a human services agency that portrays a welfare image."

### GOAL 5. DESIGNING CENTERS THAT ARE ACCESSIBLE TO CUSTOMERS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS

For center planners, the goal of universal accessibility presented a number of challenges to facility planners, particularly to accommodate individuals with disabilities and parents with children.

Designing the facility to accommodate individuals with disabilities was easier where One-Stop partners were moving to new facilities. At its new site, the Eastside Workforce Development Center in Indiana, for example, built an outside ramp that leads to the front entrance used by other customers. Several states, like Minnesota, mandated that all One-Stop centers be retrofitted to meet ADA requirements. For older existing buildings, however, it was more difficult to comply with federal and state standards, particularly where the center was located on more than one floor. Some localities, such as the FutureWorks Center in Massachusetts adapted some of their interior equipment to the needs for the hearing or sight impaired, and the state of Minnesota mandated that these adaptations be made in each of their One-Stop centers.

In a few sites, space was configured to meet the needs of adult customers with children. A "kids space" off to one side equipped with toys and a snack room with vending machines was an amenity that many parents valued. The Waukesha (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center has a child care facility that cares for young children when their parents are visiting the center. Des Moines Workforce Development Center in Iowa has created a "kids space" in one corner of the reception area with books and games for children and a large aquarium.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS, CHALLENGES, AND NEXT STEPS

All sites had created new space or renovated existing space to make the One-Stop center facility support the One-Stop goals of universality, customer choice and integrated services. Case study sites were able to make substantial progress in finding appropriate sites and designing appropriate facilities.

- All sites were able to co-locate multiple partners; a few developed sites for a broad range of agencies.
- Within these facilities, most sites were able to configure the space to facilitate integrated services.
- The environment in most centers was attractive and business-like. These characteristics can greatly facilitate attracting a broad range of customers, both individuals and employers.

Despite these accomplishments, however, centers were not able to accomplish all their goals for One-Stop facilities. They faced several constraints, including: existing leases that could not be bought out; existing spaces that could not be modified to the extent needed; and limited funding. Further some sites were reluctant to make long-term commitments for reconfigured space while they were still uncertain about which agencies wanted to be co-located and what their space and equipment needs would be.

Thus, the case study sites are expected to continue to make revisions to their physical facilities in the next several years. As existing leases expire and partnerships solidify, more centers will be able to develop facilities that more fully support their One-Stop goals.

# 4. CREATING AN EFFECTIVE ONE-STOP INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE

## INTRODUCTION

All case study sites agreed that offering automated services based on new and improved information technologies is essential for serving greater numbers of One-Stop customers with diminishing resources. But creating an effective One-Stop information infrastructure is also intimately linked to the overall One-Stop system transformation goals of (1) enhancing customer choice by delivering easily accessed high-quality information that will help employers and job-seekers make good decisions about the future and (2) creating seamless service delivery systems by coordinating the efforts of multiple agencies.

Thus, information technology is viewed by some states as the "linchpin" of the One-Stop initiative. For example, One-Stop policy makers in Indiana expressed the opinion that using information technology effectively was the most important factor in improving that state's One-Stop system—more important than co-locating staff or creating integrated physical One-Stop facilities. Similarly, respondents in Wisconsin described information technology as the infrastructure needed to support the labor market information that drives both workforce development planning and individual customer services.

One interesting feature of the One-Stop information systems developed in the case study sites is that the distinction between information systems as *vehicles to deliver customer products* and information systems as *program management tools* is beginning to disappear. Increasingly, customers are being invited to manage their own service delivery process by accessing automated information systems. As part of this process, customers are asked to enter information about their needs, interests, and service preferences, and their level of satisfaction with the services they receive. Providing this information enables a customer to obtain information and enhanced services tailored to his or her needs. In a number of sites, it also provides the basis for the initiation of a client-level case record and case management file that can be used to guide the subsequent provision of staffed services to that customer and document the various services he or she receives over time. When it is time to assess system accomplishments and identify needed improvements, information from the same information systems can be compiled and analyzed to describe customers, summarize the services they are using, and identify how services could be adapted to better meet customer needs.

## GOALS FOR DEVELOPING A SHARED TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE

An effective One-Stop information infrastructure supports several different aspects of One-Stop operations. Effective use of information technology was widely perceived as essential to the following goals:

1. Improving communication among on-site and off-site partners.
2. Increasing the accessibility and flexibility of One-Stop information services.
3. Freeing up staff to provide more personalized services and improving the coordination of services among One-Stop service providers.
4. Supporting system accountability by making it possible to measure progress toward common One-Stop system goals.

A number of One-Stop sites are developing new information infrastructures to deliver information services to customers and facilitate communication and information exchange among One-Stop agency partners. In this chapter we describe how the information technologies utilized by the different case study sites furthered each of these goals.

## GOAL 1. IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AMONG ONE-STOP PARTNERS

In their efforts to build information-technology bridges between and among different agencies, One-Stop implementation states and local sites have faced challenges at three different levels: (1) facilitating day-to-day communications among One-Stop staff sharing the same facility; (2) supporting regular communication among partners located at multiple service sites within local One-Stop networks; and (3) providing for two-way information exchange on a statewide basis between state agency headquarters, state and local policy boards, and local One-Stop centers. Exhibit 4-1 describes how states and local areas have addressed these challenges.

### Facilitating Day-to-Day Communication Among Center Staff

The first challenge described by most sites was that of facilitating day-to-day communication among One-Stop staff sharing the same facility. Respondents indicated that One-Stop staff in different partner agencies needed to communicate frequently

## Exhibit 4-1
## Examples of Approaches to Facilitate Communication Among One-Stop Partners

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | All One-Stop center staff can exchange e-mail within centers, across centers, and with the state office using a wide area network. By the end of 1996, all staff were scheduled to have electronic mail and data transfer capabilities through the Internet. |
| Maryland | Communication among the local partners located throughout the Baltimore Career Center Network has been identified as an important system-level need. To address this need, local partners are using most of the local One-Stop planning grant received from the state to develop an automated scheduling network linking different service sites. Staff at any networked site will be able to dial-in to the scheduling bulletin board at any other site, pull up the schedule for any of the group workshops, counseling sessions, or training sessions offered at the site, and schedule a customer for an available time slot. |
| Massachusetts | The state has introduced a $2.7 million state bond measure that will help pay for the development of electronic linkages between regional employment boards, career centers, and the state career center office.<br>At the FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield, Massachusetts, all staff can send and receive both internal and external electronic mail. |
| Minnesota | The co-location of partners within a unified Workforce Center in Anoka County has made it easier for partners to share information. Recently interpretations of state data privacy laws have clarified when the sharing of information is permissible. As a result, ES and UI staff may now access files from county-administered programs on an "as-needed" basis.<br>There is a presumption that all Workforce Center partners will eventually share a single file server, a single leased communication line, and shared network resources through the state's communication network. |

**Exhibit 4-1** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | Ohio has developed "The Partnership Exchange," a document that serves as a guide for local information-sharing agreements. The state agreement was signed by the chiefs of the departments of Human Services, Employment Services, Education, Aging, Development, and the Ohio Board of Regents. This guide describes which information generated or maintained by the One-Stop partner agencies is confidential and the circumstances under which confidential information may be disclosed or exchanged.<br>Several local systems are in the process of developing local agreements. Plans at the Wood County Employment Resource Center include developing electronic linkages with off-site partners so that they can dial-in to access automated services and make client referrals. |
| Texas | Texas has developed a Texas Workforce Integration Network that will support the delivery of automated customer products and will also allow for a planned integrated client-management system.<br>In Tarrant County (Dallas-Fort Worth), implementation grant funds were used to hire staff charged with developing a county-wide information network to support One-Stop operations. The resulting linkages will make it possible to provide access to common client databases and share information across partner agencies. |
| Wisconsin | Systems for facilitating day-to-day communication among staff within the Waukesha County Workforce Development Center include a common electronic mail and on-line scheduling system intended to help staff "act and feel like one organization."<br>To accomplish this, agencies that still used mainframe-based MIS systems arranged to equip their staff with personal computers that could emulate "dumb terminals" when accessing their agency's mainframe computer and could also give them access to the PC-based communications network within the center. |

about their shared interests—in the facility, in common customers, and in ideas for coordinating services—so that they could all become familiar with all One-Stop programs and build a common One-Stop "team" identity. Initial barriers to the flow of information among co-located One-Stop staff often included the absence of a shared telephone messaging or electronic mail system.

Several One-Stop centers found that installing an integrated telephone system and a computer-based electronic mail system improved the frequency and quality of communications among staff from different agencies. For example, in the Waukesha County Workforce Development Center, agency partners invested in personal computers for all on-site staff and installed a PC-based communications network that includes a common electronic mail system and an on-line scheduling system. Using the on-line scheduling system, staff can access each others' daily schedules and reserve specific times for planned activities in shared meeting rooms and classrooms. This new communications infrastructure, respondents said, has helped staff "act and feel like they belong to one organization."

Where systems for improving day-to-day communication were not put into place, staff from different agencies communicated less frequently and less effectively. At the Des Moines Workforce Development Center, for example, respondents indicated that the building of a sense of common enterprise had been hampered by the absence of improved communication tools. Although co-location in the shared facility had made staff from different agencies more aware of what partner agencies do, most staff in the Des Moines center were still primarily involved only with their own agency's programs at the time of the evaluation site visit.

### Supporting Regular Communication among Partners within Local One-Stop Networks

The second communication and information-exchange challenge faced by a number of the case study sites was improving communication with staff in other local One-Stop service delivery sites—including other full-service One-Stop centers that were part of the same local network or additional satellite locations maintained by one or more partner agencies. For example, this challenge was an important one in the Tarrant County (Texas) One-Stop network, which includes seven different full-service centers administered by two different agencies. To address this challenge, the managers of the local network used local One-Stop implementation grant funds to staff the development of a county-wide information network. During the first year of One-

Stop implementation, project staff identified available computers, configured computers, and installed networking equipment to link the seven One-Stop centers to each other and to the local board responsible for overseeing the system. These linkages will make it possible to share information across partner agencies and provide partners access to a shared client database.

Other sites undertook less ambitious approaches to facilitate communication across local One-Stop partners not housed in the same facility. The Baltimore Career Center Network created a dial-in scheduling bulletin board that local One-Stop agencies throughout the city can use to schedule customers for available time slots in group workshops, counseling sessions, or training sessions offered by any other agency. The Wood County (Ohio) Employment Resource Center plans to develop electronic linkages between off-site partners and the One-Stop center so off-site partners can dial in to make client referrals and access automated services on behalf of their clients.

### Supporting Communication Among State and Local Partners

Several states anticipate that a statewide information infrastructure will eventually connect all One-Stop career centers with each other, with regional policy boards, and with the state. These information networks will not only support automated services to One-Stop customers throughout the state, they will also facilitate staff-to-staff communications and information exchange. Texas has made the most progress in creating the information infrastructure to support this vision by developing a Texas Workforce Integration Network that will eventually support an integrated client-management system. At the time of the site visit, Massachusetts had introduced a $2.7 million state bond measure to help pay for the development of electronic linkages between regional employment boards, career centers, and the state career center office. Minnesota anticipates that all partners within One-Stop centers will eventually share a single file server, a single leased communication line, and shared network resources through the state's communication network.

## GOAL 2. PROVIDING USER-FRIENDLY ACCESS TO INFORMATION FOR CUSTOMERS

A number of states had already made substantial progress in developing automated labor market information and career information products for direct customer access prior to receiving the One-Stop implementation grant. The One-Stop initiative was the occasion for reviewing these products, planning product enhancements, filling gaps, and developing a number of different technology platforms from which these products could be made available to customers. Using electronic linkages, most states have made self-access products available not only at staffed One-Stop career centers, but also at a wide variety of community locations (e.g., libraries, department of motor vehicles offices, other social service agencies) as well as from individual homes and offices equipped with a computer and modem.

In seeking to create user-friendly automated services, a number of states have developed integrated packages oriented to the needs of specific users. For example, Connecticut has developed a job-seekers' component, a students' component, and an employers' component. Sophisticated software applications have also made it possible for customers to receive information tailored to their particular career interests, characteristics, or other specifications (e.g., jobs available in a particular geographic area or occupations in which expected wages exceed a certain level).

Key components of One-Stop information services in most states included statewide systems for (1) listing and reviewing job openings and matching job seekers to available jobs; (2) accessing America's Job Bank for nationwide job listings and America's Talent Bank for job-seeker resumes; and (3) providing career information, labor market information, and information about employment and training resources. Additional products under development in some states included self-assessment tools and on-line community-service directories. For example, Maryland is planning to expand its "career exploration" cluster by adding an automated self-assessment component and a computerized skill inventory. In Chapter 9, *Providing One-Stop Services to Individuals*, we describe the content of these information services in more detail.

As described in Exhibit 4-2, a number of sites have used new information technologies—including computer networks with client-server software, electronic bulletin boards, and access to the Internet—to multiply the number of different modes through which customers can access information services and to increase the interactive features of the products. Among the different delivery modes pursued in the case study states and local sites were the following:

- Self-service access to automated products for individual customers via computer workstations and multi-media laboratories within One-Stop centers. Most sites provide a resource librarian, resource specialist, or written user's guide to help orient customers to the automated information services.

## Exhibit 4-2
## Examples of Making Automated Services Available through Multiple Modes

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Automated labor market and occupational information services are available (1) on the state's public access network via workstations at career center offices; (2) through an Internet Web site for *Connecticut Works* which has links to the Connecticut Job Bank; and (3) through kiosks installed in state libraries and Department of Motor Vehicles offices.<br>Automated voice response services are available for UI continuing claims and are being introduced for initial UI applications. A system for automated self-registration for ES services is under development. |
| Indiana | As part of the One-Stop initiative, Indiana is designing an integrated technology infrastructure to support customer access to information services and sharing of client information across programs. The Internet will be the major outside access point for the system, with local office use supported by a combination of wide-area networks and local-area networks.<br>Indiana is also installing kiosks and PC-based systems providing access to the state's automated job listings within One-Stop centers in information resource areas, as well as in post-secondary schools, libraries, and other community sites. Additional points of access to automated information services will include remote access via telephone bulletin boards and the Internet. |
| Iowa | Workforce development centers are envisioned as having multiple electronic points of customer access for information and services including libraries, K-12 schools, community colleges, universities, and home computers via modem. The state's "Data Center" is an electronic bulletin board that offers labor market and job information. |

**Exhibit 4-2** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Maryland | Maryland has taken responsibility at the state level to develop the "technological backbone" of the One-Stop system throughout the state by providing the hardware and software to deliver automated services to employers and job seekers.<br>Initial investments were used to provide these services by linking all local workstations to a mainframe computer. During the second year of One-Stop implementation, the state planned to install local area networks to support the CareerNet software as well as developing Internet and other remote access features. |
| Massachusetts | The state has invested heavily in developing automated products that will support the delivery of core services to customers of the individual career centers. These products include a state electronic Job Bank, a Talent Bank, and an Education and Training Database. A state World Wide Web site provides electronic linkages to these products as well as to a variety of other federal, state, and locally-initiated Internet sites related to career centers, workforce development, education, financial aid, labor market information, and local services. Local career center operators are free to develop or procure their own self-contained automated products for career exploration, resume development, or other core services. |
| Ohio | Key automated information products include systems with information on careers, labor market information, and economic development and planning measures. New products will include America's Talent Bank, a resume preparation system, the incorporation of self-assessment tools into automated systems, and the development of an on-line community services directory.<br>Under the One-Stop initiative, the state has targeted technology upgrades to take advantage of new information-sharing and information-management technologies. Goals include (1) making products available to customers through more user-friendly interfaces and (2) making automated systems available to staff and customers in an increasing number of sites and through a broader set of delivery platforms (including local area networks and Internet access). |

- Access to automated products at satellite service sites hosted by a local One-Stop partner.
- Self-service information kiosks with touch-screen access to a number of different information services in "high-traffic" areas, such as shopping malls, discount stores, libraries, department of motor vehicles' offices, and secondary and post-secondary schools.
- Electronic bulletin boards with toll-free phone numbers that employer or individual customers can dial up to access automated information services and products.
- Internet World Wide Web sites created by individual One-Stop centers or states, with linkages to a variety of automated products also available on the Internet.
- Telephone request lines through which interested employers can request faxes of labor market information.
- On-line publication of periodic labor market information reports with up-to-date state and local information.
- Cable linkages to schools to make labor market information and career information resources available to students.

Generally, the customer response to these different options for receiving information services has been positive. Although some sites had worried about whether customers would like automated self-access services, individual customers responded positively in most sites because they feel "in charge" of the service process. Kiosks appeared to be the most problematic approach. Difficulties experienced with kiosks in some sites included vandalism, lack of timely updating of information, and absence of linkages to additional guided or enhanced services.

Increasingly, One-Stop centers ask customers to complete a self-registration process as the first stage in receiving a variety of self-access services. The information entered by the customer is used to create automated case records that are used to guide ongoing case management and follow-up services. Examples of self-registration procedures planned or initiated by the case study One-Stop implementation sites include the following:

- Automated self-registration for Employment Services (in Connecticut and Indiana).
- Registration as a user of the automated One-Stop information and labor exchange system (in Maryland).

- Completion by customers of their own UI benefits application information in person or through remote access (e.g., in Indiana, Texas).
- Direct posting of job openings by employers using electronic linkages (in Connecticut and Indiana).
- Self-registration in talent banks or posting of skills descriptions by job-seekers at One-Stop offices or from off-site through electronic linkages (e.g., in Connecticut, Indiana, Maryland).
- Enrollment in education and training classes (in Indiana).

In most of these self-registration systems, the information entered by the customers is entered into a case record that becomes available to other One-Stop partners on an as-needed basis.

However, most One-Stop sites have tried to limit the amount of information requested of self-service customers, lest the information requests deter customers from using the available services. The FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield, Massachusetts, is particularly sensitive to this issue. To minimize the customer burden associated with recording information about service utilization patterns, this center provides membership cards with identification bar codes to each customer. Every time customers access a given service, they are asked to "swipe" their membership card through a card reader to create an automated record of service usage.

## GOAL 3. SUPPORTING THE DELIVERY OF COORDINATED AND CONSOLIDATED SERVICES TO ONE-STOP CUSTOMERS

A number of case study sites are developing integrated information systems to support the coordination or consolidation of services, including intake, eligibility determination, and enrollment. Customers can benefit by being able to access all One-Stop services after completing a single intake and enrollment process. Program operators can benefit by reducing the staff time devoted to front-end processes, while still sharing access to the information obtained from these integrated processes. In addition, a number of sites are developing integrated case management systems that will facilitate the ongoing delivery of seamless services to individuals who receive services funded by more than one program.

### Developing Information Systems to Support Integrated Intake and Eligibility Determination

The development of a common intake system is viewed as a key objective in many One-Stop states and local sites. As described in Exhibit 4-3, five of the nine case study states—Indiana, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and Texas—are developing a statewide integrated client-level information system that all One-Stop partners can use to facilitate a common intake process.

Indiana had made the most progress in actually implementing a system at the time of the evaluation site visits. All 26 service locations in Indiana that are or will become One-Stop centers had begun using a "self-service" automated single intake process. The information provided by customers during the automated intake process is placed in customer case files, which staff from any program can access. These automated case files have replaced "traveling paper files" as the means for sharing eligibility and client information across partners. In both local sites visited, the common intake process was being used by ES, UI, and JTPA partners. In one site it was being considered for use by the welfare agency.

In contrast, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and Texas were still planning and designing their integrated information systems during the first year of One-Stop implementation. Both Iowa and Minnesota are members of a multi-state consortium that has received a grant from America's Labor Market Information System (ALMIS) to develop a common access and intake information protocol for One-Stop systems. Ohio and Texas are each pursuing the development of an integrated client information system independently.

Because these systems were not yet operational during the first year of One-Stop implementation, local sites often developed temporary or ad hoc systems to support coordinated intake procedures. For example, local partners at the Anoka County (Minnesota) Workforce Center had developed a common three-page application form on which they were basing preliminary eligibility determination. In Tarrant County (Texas), One-Stop partners decided to purchase their own "off-the-shelf" intake and pre-assessment automated modules and to link their own information systems using wide area networks, while waiting for the state to develop a statewide information network and integrated intake system.

One barrier to the implementation of integrated intake and eligibility determination systems was a concern about client confidentiality rules. However, a number of different case study sites found that after One-Stop partners were co-located,

## Exhibit 4-3
## Examples of How Information Technology is Used to Support Coordinated Service Delivery

| | |
|---|---|
| Indiana | The state is undertaking a long-term planning process to develop a single integrated intake/access module. At the present time, a "self-service" automated single intake process has been developed by the state and is being used by all 26 service locations that are or will become One-Stop centers.<br>At the local case study sites, the information provided by customers during the single intake process is automatically placed in customer case files and enables customers to receive services from any staff person with access to the case files. It has replaced the "traveling paper file" for sharing eligibility and client information across partners. Automated case management systems have been initiated at the local level, primarily through the purchase and adaptation of proprietary systems. |
| Iowa | Iowa is a member of a multi-state consortium that has received an ALMIS grant to develop a common access and intake system for One-Stop systems. ES, JTPA, and welfare-to-work programs are expected to be the first programs to use the new system. Vocational rehabilitation is expected to join at a later date.<br>Following the recommendations of a consultant, the state designed three phases in developing an integrated MIS: (1) establishing data access linkages among existing programs; (2) developing a common intake system; and (3) creating a fully-integrated case management, case tracking, and automated eligibility system. |
| Maryland | At the state level, an integrated intake and case management work group was planned for the second year of the implementation grant. Among the issues this group was scheduled to consider were the development of a broad tracking system that would allow client scheduling and case notes to be shared across partners. At the time of the site visit, case management and service information were not shared between partners at individual centers. |

**Exhibit 4-3** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Minnesota | Minnesota is part of GEORGE, a multi-state consortium working to develop software to support integrated intake and the delivery of post-intake services in a One-Stop environment. At the time of the evaluation site visit, state staff were "somewhat optimistic" about linking JTPA, ES, UI, and VR information systems, but viewed the development of common intake with other agencies, such as the welfare agency, as a greater challenge.<br>At the Anoka County Workforce Center, local partners had developed a common three-page application on which they now base preliminary eligibility determination. |
| Ohio | Ohio is developing a model for a common One-Stop client-level data base that will include a "common intake record" and a "record of service."<br>Ohio encourages local service delivery areas to develop system-wide common intake procedures. Job-seekers will be required to input basic demographic data only once at a One-Stop center or partner service site. Partners will share information about subsequent service utilization and outcomes. |
| Texas | The state has attempted to take the lead in the development of information systems to support integrated services. Information components targeted for development include an integrated system for intake, eligibility determination, and shared service referrals. In addition, a component is being developed to support integrated case management.<br>Because of delays in the development of the state system, some local areas have proceeded on their own to develop unified intake procedures. For example, the Lake Jackson Career Center has developed an integrated intake form to support integrated customer reception and referral on an interim basis. |
| Wisconsin | Under the One-Stop initiative, Wisconsin is planning to design an automated "menu of services" that can be tailored to the needs of each One-Stop center. Customers entering the center will be able to review, select, and automatically register for desired local services. The system will also perform an initial review of customer eligibility for some services. |

they were usually able to overcome confidentiality barriers that had previously prevented agencies from exchanging client-level information. In Ohio, cross-program information sharing was facilitated by negotiating state-level agreements among the ES, UI, JTPA, and Veterans Employment Services programs. The state has strongly encouraged any additional local partners to negotiate local confidentiality agreements so that all One-Stop partners can access data maintained by other partner agencies on an as-needed basis. Respondents in several other sites indicated that confidentiality concerns should not be insurmountable barriers to the negotiation of inter-agency information-sharing agreements, because agencies can construct "fire walls" in shared information systems to protect data elements that they do not want to share.

### Developing Integrated Information Systems to Support Service Planning and Case Management

Building on the tools that support integrated intake and eligibility determination, a number of One-Stop states and local sites have begun to develop shared automated case management systems. In sites where One-Stop partners have continued to provide separate and distinct services, these information systems have enabled One-Stop partners to coordinate service management by sharing information about customers receiving services from more than one program. In sites where One-Stop partners have developed integrated services, these information systems have supported the delivery of consolidated services by interagency service teams (e.g., cross-agency teams providing consolidated assessment, pre-employment training, or job search assistance/placement services to customers from several different categorical programs).

In some states, the planned state information system for One-Stop services will include the capacity to record individual assessment results, service plans, services received, and customer outcomes. For example, the prototype being developed by the multi-state "GEORGE" consortium—in which both Iowa and Minnesota are participating—will include tools that all One-Stop partner agencies can use to schedule client services, share case notes, support customer work plans, and document the delivery of transition services.

In a number of other states, however, the responsibility for developing information systems to support service coordination has been delegated to local One-Stop partnerships. For example, in Indiana, local service delivery areas have purchased existing automated case management systems. The product purchased by most local sites uses the information obtained through the state's single intake process to create case records that are used to track subsequent customer services and outcomes. Wisconsin and Connecticut also encouraged local One-Stop systems to develop integrated case management systems, but left it up to each local area to develop shared information systems to support consolidated or coordinated case management.

Several case study sites found that the coordination of employer services across One-Stop partners was facilitated by developing a shared information system on local employer contacts. For example, Massachusetts developed an "account management system" to track employers' use of career centers and gave local career center operators the option of using the state system or developing one of their own. Local staff at the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center developed their own common database on employers to facilitate shared case management of employer contacts. With the help of this system, the partner agencies at this center developed an informal account representative system across all partners that identifies a single primary staff liaison for each employer.

### GOAL 4. SUPPORTING SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ONE-STOP SYSTEM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Because of the continued need to meet the specific reporting requirements imposed by different categorical programs—and because they do not want to lose their substantial investments in their current data processing systems—most states have not developed totally integrated accountability systems across all workforce development programs. Instead, most of the One-Stop states and local sites plan to use a "just-in-time" data extraction approach in which they build on existing program-based management information systems by "tying them together and putting a unified face on them."

As described in Exhibit 4-4, several states are planning integrated One-Stop client-level information systems that will be able to provide information about One-Stop system-level accomplishments. As previously mentioned, Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, and Texas are all developing integrated information systems that are designed to guide coordinated service delivery and support systemwide accountability. In each case, the approach pursued has been to design an "open architecture" format that can extract information from and provide information to a wide variety of linked program-based information systems.

## Exhibit 4-4

## Examples of How Technology Supports Shared Accountability for System Outcomes

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Integrating management information systems is an important long-term goal. However, the continuation of individual reporting requirements for categorical programs has prevented much progress toward the creation of an integrated client-level information system. Rather than replacing the existing information systems for JTPA, ES, and UI, partners have developed information-sharing agreements. ES/UI and JTPA agency staff can now access each other's databases from their own offices. |
| Iowa | The state is taking the lead in developing an integrated information system to support the reporting and accountability functions for a consolidated workforce development system.<br>Following the recommendations of a consultant, the state designed three phases in developing an integrated MIS: (1) establishing data access linkages among existing programs; (2) developing a common intake system; and (3) creating a fully-integrated case management, case tracking, and automated eligibility system. The first two phases were occurring simultaneously during the first year of One-Stop implementation. |
| Massachusetts | The state is working with an outside consulting firm to develop a state-level information system that can extract, manipulate, and store data from the local information systems developed by each career center operator. The state has taken responsibility for creating an interface to communicate with each local data system as well as for creating a consolidated data management system at the state level that will take over the preparation of required program-level reports.<br>Massachusetts has developed an account management system to track employer use of the career centers. Individual centers are given the option of using the state system or developing one of their own. |

**Exhibit 4-4** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | Using Ohio's prototype for a "rolling common intake" system, job seekers will be required to input basic demographic data only once at a One-Stop center or partner agency. Partners will share information about subsequent service utilization and outcomes. Customer information will be integrated by creating an expert front-end that links the information systems maintained by ES, UI, and JTPA. Ultimately, development of the "record of service" system will reduce the need for duplicate data entry and facilitate information sharing across programs. |
| Texas | The state has attempted to take the lead in the development of information systems to support integrated services. In addition a component is being developed to support integrated accounting for customer outcomes across the One-Stop system.<br>The state is phasing out its mainframe-based system in favor of modular computer systems. An open architectural system has been designed to accommodate linkages with a myriad of existing local information systems<br>Local areas are also proceeding with their own information-sharing linkages while waiting for the state system to become operational. |
| Wisconsin | Through the IT Blueprint Project, Wisconsin will guide the development of information technology to ensure state-local connectivity and compatibility while encouraging local refinements and innovations. The goal is to support coordinated/consolidated case management and to facilitate the sharing of information across programs.<br>Center partners in Waukesha County are not attempting to design a common MIS to replace individual programs' record keeping requirements. Instead, they are developing a tracking system that would capture a few measures each program collects in common and that could be used to generate broad statistics about participants and the services they use. Initial registration in this system would be accomplished by customers upon arrival at the center. |

The approach taken by Massachusetts permits local One-Stop career center operators to maintain information systems in whatever format and structure they prefer. Rather than developing a single integrated information system for use by all local One-Stop service providers, this state is developing a system to extract, store, and manipulate data from the local information systems developed by each career center operator. The state will create an interface to communicate with each local data system and will build a consolidated data management system at the state level. Plans call for this state-level system to prepare the required program-level reports for each categorical funding stream.

In the absence of integrated statewide information systems, some individual One-Stop centers have developed their own integrated reporting systems to summarize center-wide accomplishments. For example, center partners in the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center have designed a new center-wide performance tracking system that captures a few measures collected by all partner programs. This system—built upon self-registration information provided by customers—will be used to generate broad statistics about center customers and the services they use.

The One-Stop network in Baltimore is using aggregate statistics generated by each partner agency—on the numbers of units of service provided and number of customers served—to assess performance against integrated "production goals" established for the centers. Local partners are measuring the following outcomes for center customers on a monthly and annual basis: (1) the number of job placements for all customers as well as the number of job placements for JTPA customers; (2) the daily traffic flow through the Center; (3) the number of enrollments in the automated Job Bank; and (4) the number of individuals attending a JTPA employment preparation seminar, participating in self-paced training in the local resource laboratory, or participating in GED training or a skills brush-up class. Production statistics are reviewed monthly as part of a Center "performance review," which compares agency performance against goals.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN DEVELOPING A SUPPORTIVE TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE

The One-Stop case study sites made substantial progress in applying new information technologies to improve the delivery of customer services and increase the sharing of information among participating agencies. Factors impeding the further development of integrated information systems included concerns about client confidentiality, the continued need to meet the separate reporting requirements of different categorical programs, and the substantial investment of time and money required to develop the information infrastructure and design shared information systems to accommodate the needs of all partners. Considering these barriers, the accomplishments made within the case study states and local sites were notable. Among the accomplishments made by the One-Stop states were the following:

- Developing the information infrastructure needed to support communication among staff within One-Stop centers, among One-Stop centers in the same local systems, and between One-Stop centers and state-level agencies.
- Making automated information services available to One-Stop customers through a variety of delivery modes including on-site services at One-Stop centers, information kiosks in areas with high pedestrian traffic, and remote access through dial-in bulletin boards and World Wide Web sites on the Internet.
- Increasing the range of services available through self-access modes, including, in some sites, registration for UI benefits, registration for job matching services, posting of jobs by employers, posting of resumes by job seekers, use of automated self-assessment tools, and registration for education or training services.
- Developing shared information systems to support coordinated intake, eligibility determination, case management and other services by staff from multiple workforce development agencies.
- Developing methods to exchange and pool client-level or aggregate-level performance to measure overall accomplishments of the One-Stop system.

With respect to the delivery of self-access services to One-Stop customers, the information technologies harnessed during the first year of One-Stop implementation made possible clear enhancements in the range of available services and the accessibility of services. Needed improvements noted in a number of sites included working out some of the inevitable technical "bugs" associated with the introduction of a new system. There was agreement across most sites, however, that automated services—supplemented by the availability of staffed services when needed—were providing high-quality services to a broad range of One-Stop employer and job-seeker customers.

In some sites, the first-year efforts represented the initial stages of a long-term plan to develop shared information systems. In other sites, the information sharing procedures developed during the first year were not intended to be permanent, but rather were interim solutions put in place until the future of integrated workforce development program legislation became clearer. Thus, many questions about system-wide accountability and how to use information technology to further the consolidation of One-Stop services across categorical programs remained unanswered at the end of the first year of One-Stop implementation.

# 5. BUILDING STAFF CAPACITY

## INTRODUCTION

One-Stop system-building generates a need for staff training in a number of different ways. First, training is often required to meld staff from a number of different partner agencies—each with its own identity, work culture, program rules, and job expectations—into a functioning One-Stop career center system characterized by a common customer service approach and seamless services. Second, because One-Stop service designs emphasize the use of information technology to deliver customer services and support internal management functions, One-Stop staff often need training in computer literacy and specific computer skills. Finally, in a One-Stop setting, staff must often move from a narrow program-based set of skills to a broader skills-set that enables them to link customers to a variety of services supported by different program-based funding streams and community resources. Because of these training needs, the case study sites all identified capacity building initiatives as essential to the success of One-Stop implementation.

In this chapter, we discuss the key similarities and differences across the case study sites in (1) the objectives of capacity building efforts, (2) the specific activities undertaken during the first year of One-Stop implementation to further these goals, and (3) the progress made in the development of the new One-Stop capacity building systems and the important steps identified for the future.

## GOALS OF CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORTS

Case study sites often viewed staff training as part of a larger human resource investment strategy that also included organizational restructuring into a "high performance workplace" that continuously improved quality. Emulating successful private sector strategies and approaches, states expected capacity building efforts to improve overall productivity and create an ongoing commitment to innovation and the delivery of high-quality services among career center staff. In many sites, One-Stop partners recognized that policy board members, managers, and direct service staff had distinct training needs. For example, policy board members often needed training in team processes, conflict resolution, and the development of integrated services. Managers often needed enhanced skills in consensus decision making, marketing, information systems, performance management, and team-building. Local service delivery staff often needed increased familiarity with the entire range of services available to customers through multiple funding streams as well as enhanced technology skills for helping customers use the resources available within the One-Stop center.

Specific capacity building goals identified by the case study sites consisted of the following:

1. Coordinating the roles played by state and local One-Stop partners in planning and conducting staff development efforts.
2. Preparing policy makers and staff from multiple agencies to work together in a high-performance work environment.
3. Cross-training career center staff so they are familiar with all the programs and services available to One-Stop customers and are able to carry out broad functions within the One-Stop center.
4. Preparing staff from multiple agencies to provide integrated One-Stop services—such as reception, assessment, and case management—and to support customers in using One-Stop resource rooms and career libraries.
5. Training managers and technical support staff in specific new skills needed in the One-Stop environment, including those related to marketing, measuring customer satisfaction, and using performance data to support continuous improvement.

Different case study sites addressed these goals in differing ways. Below we highlight the different approaches used to address capacity-building goals.

### GOAL 1. COORDINATING THE CAPACITY BUILDING ROLES PLAYED BY DIFFERENT ONE-STOP PARTNERS

In general, state and local One-Stop partners agreed that the state needed to play an important role in building staff capacity at both the state and local levels. However, in a number of early-implementation sites, states were not fully prepared to provide assistance with local first-year start-up efforts.

State-level partners in the One-Stop initiative were often involved in assessing needs, developing overall goals, allocating resources, and identifying potential providers of training. Typically, the One-Stop implementation states designated one entity to lead capacity building efforts. Examples of designated lead entities include an existing state training institute, the human resources unit or a training unit within the lead One-Stop agency, and the state staff responsible for state–local coordination of One-Stop system-building issues.

In almost all states, however, the official lead agency for capacity building was supported, assisted, or advised by a work group representing the different One-Stop partner agencies. Selected local agency staff often served on state capacity building work groups so that local perspectives were represented in the state-level planning process. Capacity building work groups also coordinated their efforts with the parallel work groups responsible for planning related One-Stop activities such as marketing and developing integrated management information systems and technology-based products. In many states, a number of local One-Stop systems and centers simultaneously convened local capacity-building teams to identify training needs and design and coordinate staff training activities at the local level.

Responsibility for the actual design and delivery of training was assigned to a variety of different One-Stop partners, depending on staff availability and expertise. The different training delivery arrangements included the following: (1) the design and delivery of One-Stop-related training by staff from existing workforce development training institutes or state agency training divisions, (2) the development and delivery of training by state One-Stop planning team members, (3) the development of formal or informal "peer training networks" to promote exchanges of information among staff from local One-Stop career centers, and (4) the delivery of local training activities by staff within local partner agencies or by experts procured from outside sources.

Exhibit 5-1 provides examples of case study states that had particularly well-developed statewide capacity building activities to support the One-Stop initiative at the time of the evaluation site visits. In many of these states, local One-Stop representatives had also been invited to participate in the design of state-initiated training efforts. In addition, states with well-developed training approaches often encouraged local career center systems to develop their own locally-initiated training or—in the case of "train the trainer" materials developed at the state level—adapt state training curricula to meet local circumstances.

A second group of states were in the process of planning statewide capacity-building initiatives but had only a limited ability to provide assistance to local areas during the first year of One-Stop implementation. In these cases, states usually tried to respond to urgent local needs on an ad hoc basis. For example, at the time of the site visit, state One-Stop local liaisons in Wisconsin would alert the state-level Capacity Building Team if a local One-Stop site needed immediate training assistance (e.g., conflict resolution training to help the site deal with tensions among One-Stop partners)

## Exhibit 5-1
## Case Study Examples of States with Well-Developed Capacity Building Roles

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Staff development and training occupy a central place in the state's One-Stop initiative. CTDOL's Staff Development Unit (SDU) is comprised of eight full-time staff persons. SDU staff define their jobs not only as trainers, but as "performance consultants" to local areas.<br>Most One-Stop staff have been provided with an orientation to the *Connecticut Works* system, inter-agency team building, and cross-training skills. SDU staff have held multiple rounds of training in each of the regions on three "basic skills" designed to improve One-Stop customer services: (1) telephone skills, (2) basic communication skills including active listening and problem solving, and (3) skills specifically related to One-Stop services.<br>In addition to direct training, SDU has also developed "train the trainers" sessions and encouraged networks of peer-led training sessions and the involvement of field staff in peer-to-peer training programs. A state training goal is to encourage "creativity" among local office staff. |
| Maryland | The state of Maryland has placed a premium on capacity building initiatives to support statewide One-Stop implementation. Primary responsibility for capacity building projects resides with the state's training institute, the Maryland Institute for Employment & Training Professionals (MIETP).<br>A collaborative approach is used that involves state and local officials in both training design and delivery. MIETP training includes: (1) orientation for local staff covering "managing change" and the state's "inverted pyramid" model of One-Stop service delivery (using a train-the-trainer approach) and (2) an intensive 16-day-long curriculum for resource area specialists.<br>Additional training provided by the state One-Stop technical team includes technical training on the CareerNet system. |

**Exhibit 5-1** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Indiana | Indiana has identified and begun responding to a wide range of staff development needs associated with One-Stop implementation. Training in these different areas is being provided by a wide variety of agencies and organizations, including the training section of the state lead agency's human resources unit and staff of specific state and local partners.<br>Staff training has occurred in several different waves to support the different phases of One-Stop development in the state. Early training was designed to achieve a common understanding of the One-Stop initiative and to train the staffs of JTPA, ES, UI, and VETS about the details of the different programs operating within a local career center setting. More recent waves of training have continued to focus on cross-training for front-line staff as well as on training for the new automated technology-based systems and products.<br>Current DWD staff development offerings focus on the needs of staff at various levels within the career center setting. Training for managers includes training in leading effective meetings, problem solving, and communication skills. Training for line operations staff includes training on counseling theory, basic communication skills, career counseling, and case management. |

so that the team could provide or arrange for "just-in-time" training. Similarly, in Texas, the lead One-Stop agency's Technical Assistance Director, together with other One-Stop team members, served as *de facto* facilitators for local team building training. Much training was done informally and can best be described as helping to "put out brush-fires" by helping Career Center partners develop conflict management skills.

A third group of states planned to promote local control by providing overall state guidance and financial support to local areas on capacity building issues but leaving the selection of training providers and the development of specific training curricula up to the region or local site. For example, in Ohio, the state encouraged local One-Stop stakeholders to identify potential training vendors and the types of training needed at the local level. Rather than emphasizing the direct provision of training by state staff to local One-Stop partners, members of the state One-Stop management team in Ohio have created opportunities for information-sharing among peers by sponsoring problem-solving conferences for local One-Stop practitioners. State staff have also encouraged local areas to use local One-Stop implementation funds to support locally-driven capacity building efforts.

### GOAL 2. PREPARING ONE-STOP STAFF TO WORK TOGETHER IN A HIGH-PERFORMANCE WORKPLACE

An initial capacity-building priority for most case study sites was to orient managers and staff to the goals and objectives of the transformed workforce development system—one driven by customer needs rather than program-based goals. Often, One-Stop partners attempted to organize the new integrated workforce development system around principles of total quality management, team building, customer focus, and continuous improvement. To support this organizational transformation, a number of state and local capacity building work groups developed early training activities that emphasized the skills needed for staff to work together in a high-performance workplace. Exhibit 5-2 provides examples of the different capacity-building activities undertaken within the case study sites to further this goal.

Training topics developed to support a customer focus included the following:

- The goals and objectives of One-Stop systems.
- How to provide high quality customer service.
- Team building and working as a member of a team.
- Communication skills.

## Exhibit 5-2

## Case Study Examples of Training that Emphasizes Customer Orientation and High Performance Workplace Skills

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | The state training unit has worked with local management teams to provide staff training designed to improve service quality by enhancing basic communication skills, encouraging active listening and problem solving, and improving telephone service to customers. |
| Iowa | The state Capacity Building Committee has identified training in "systems change" as a high priority. State capacity-building staff recognize that addressing organizational change and training in continuous quality improvement strategies, team building, and collective decision-making will be a complex, long-term project. Managers of the local sites have expressed particular interest in instruction in team-building so that program and agency identities can be integrated within workforce development centers. |
| Massachusetts | The staff of FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield Massachusetts is well-versed in the paradigm of the high-performance workplace. Staff are required to practice their high-performance work skills on a regular basis to improve customer services. One opportunity for staff to develop and maintain these skills is participation on the "No Excuses" Team—a cross-functional, rotating group of six FutureWorks staff charged with maintaining customer focus, designing mechanisms for customer feedback, and insuring that such feedback informs the continuous improvement process. |
| Minnesota | The Minnesota Department of Economic Security—through its Office of Quality Resources—has joined forces with the state JTPA Association to launch a "Workforce Excellence Initiative" funded in large part by a grant from the McKnight foundation. The objectives of this initiative include, among others, (1) combining resources in Workforce Centers and creating a "model partnership" among federal, state, local, and private organizations; and (2) promoting customer satisfaction and continuous improvement based on TQM criteria. Workforce Excellence training will be offered to groups of approximately 100 people at a time in a "train the champion" model. |

**Exhibit 5-2** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | First- and second-year capacity building and training activities have included orientation and discussion sessions on problem solving and conflict management for members of local governance boards. Board members have also been provided with materials developed by the State of Ohio for the purpose of improving group interaction, communication skills, and the ability to work toward a common goal. Training topics have included problem solving, improving communication, reaching consensus, and strategic planning. |
| Texas | Four regional capacity building forums were held on such themes as discussion of the state's One-Stop framework, managing the change process, and customer satisfaction. As part of its efforts to further promote its vision of One-Stop Career Centers, the Workforce Commission also sponsored a major capacity building initiative in the form of a statewide "Texas Career Center Conference" that featured a simulated "model office" to help participants understand how non-program-based case management was intended to function. |

Because implementing these high-performance themes requires new ways of behaving and interacting with co-workers, most of the training activities developed by the case study sites involved hands-on exercises in problem-solving, consensus building, and practicing new customer service skills through role-playing. In some sites, staff decided to practice team-building and consensus decision-making skills in a real-life applied context—while planning how to share One-Stop facilities and how to design integrated One-Stop services.

Planning for widespread changes in agency identities, job descriptions, physical worksites, customer services, and accountability mechanisms often aroused deep-seated fears among the staff of partner agencies about the long-term future of their agencies and their individual jobs. Thus, in addition to giving One-Stop staff a positive vision of the goal of improving customer services, One-Stop partners also had to help staff to "feel safe in the change process." Several different training approaches were developed to address the stresses resulting from organizational change. A number of the case study sites addressed training topics such as managing organizational change, decision making and conflict resolution skills, and respecting diversity among partner agencies and among customers.

State and local staff expressed several different points of view regarding how to provide training that would help staff adjust to culture change in the work setting. On the one hand, One-Stop planners in some sites wanted to begin with training in concrete technical skills rather than conflict management skills. They felt that training staff from multiple agencies in computer applications, for example, would be less threatening than "team-building training." Further, they felt that staff participating in joint training on technical topics would also result in staff developing a team identity and shared goals. In contrast, planners in some other sites felt that it was important for training workshops to tackle the reality of interagency tensions head on, before addressing technical issues.

### GOAL 3. CROSS-TRAINING ONE-STOP STAFF TO CARRY OUT BROAD FUNCTIONS

The case study sites developed a number of different service delivery arrangements to make seamless services available to One-Stop customers; these ranged from coordinated intake, information, and referral procedures (using a "no wrong-door" approach) to integrated delivery of core services. Whatever level of service integration was attempted, staff needed to develop familiarity with the different workforce development programs, eligibility rules, and detailed services available to One-Stop customers.

Exhibit 5-3 describes the different types of cross-training provided to staff in the case-study sites. Training to orient staff to the full range of One-Stop partners and services took a variety of different forms, including formal peer-to-peer training by staff within the One-Stop center, the development and dissemination of written descriptions of different categorical programs, and the formation of interagency work groups within which staff from multiple program backgrounds could share ideas about opportunities for and barriers to service consolidation. Many case study sites also installed integrated communications systems (e.g., electronic mail and telephone systems) that facilitated the informal exchange of information and technical assistance across staff from different programs and agencies.

In addition to providing staff with a general orientation to other programs, a number of case study sites cross-trained staff in the procedures and content of specific services so that One-Stop staff could take responsibility for providing a broader range of services. In some sites, cross-training was part of a formal redesign of job classifications, job descriptions, and service functions. Where formal job descriptions changed, training on new job responsibilities had to be reviewed by and coordinated with the activities of labor–management committees.

Cross-training to support the integration of the ES and UI functions was already well underway in many sites at the time of the site visits. Cross-training ES and UI staff provided a model of how to cross-train other staff to support service consolidation. In some sites, the increased focus on customer needs and the greater flexibility of job descriptions for consolidated ES/UI customer service representatives was perceived as consistent with and supportive of even broader cross-training initiatives within the One-Stop center. However, in at least one site, the intensive training associated with ES/UI cross-staffing efforts was viewed as a barrier to further efforts to cross-train staff because ES/UI staff were already "stretched to the limit" in terms of learning new functions and accommodating time for cross-training into their busy schedules.

Rather than formally implementing new integrated job descriptions, some sites had staff share job responsibilities on a more informal basis. In these sites, staff could step in when needed to provide One-Stop customers with information about and assistance with a broad range of programs. To support this change, staff were cross-

### Exhibit 5-3

### Case Study Examples of Cross-Training One-Stop Staff to Carry Out Broad Functions

| | |
|---|---|
| Indiana | Since 1985, the state has trained JTPA, ES, UI, and VETS staff about the details of the different programs operating within local career centers. More recent waves of training have continued to focus on cross-training for front-line staff, including training on counseling theory, career counseling, and case management. Technical training provided to line staff by the state in association with One-Stop development has included UI Automation Training and beginning and refresher courses in the state's automated job matching system.<br>Staff at the Lawrenceburg Workforce Development Center view cross-training as an opportunity to develop staff members' core competencies and identify opportunities for skills transfer, rather than as "learning how to do someone else's job." The capacity-building framework developed by the state and supported by the Lawrenceburg Center also places a heavy emphasis on informal peer support and training as a means of sustaining skill development and moving toward integrated services. |
| Maryland | The state has identified the need for cross-functional training, but has not yet developed specific training activities in this area. Particularly because the state does not mandate co-located programs and services, this area is perceived as especially challenging. Promising ideas include "job shadowing" arrangements among partner entities and user-friendly "primer" manuals on agency programs. |
| Massachusetts | Competitively selected career center operators have been forced to take responsibility for categorical funding streams and have attempted to implement categorical programs in a totally new context. The state Career Center Office, with the assistance of the Department of Employment and Training, has organized training sessions around the eligibility and reporting requirements for the different categorical programs. |
| Ohio | The Wood County Employment Resource Center sponsored a workshop for all partners to share information with each other. At the workshop, each partner made an oral presentation and provided written information describing the agency/organization, services available, and eligibility criteria. The session was considered to be highly successful by all partners. |

trained in a generic set of core competencies that would be useful to all One-Stop staff, rather than "learning to do someone else's job." In these cases, cross-training often took the form of job shadowing, working as interdisciplinary teams, and sharing information about different staff job duties and services. Sometimes staff with particular expertise would provide formal in-service training to other One-Stop staff (e.g., on sensitivity to individuals with disabilities). In other instances, members of interagency work groups would cross-train each other by sharing information or skills relevant to solving common customer or community problems.

### GOAL 4. PREPARING STAFF TO PROVIDE INTEGRATED ONE-STOP SERVICES

In most of the study sites, many services were re-engineered as shared One-Stop functions. These services included customer reception, providing information and referral, performing intake and eligibility screening, and assisting customers in the resource room. Additional services sometimes included in integrated service designs were assessment, case management, the provision of training assistance, assistance with child care and other supportive services, and delivery of services to employers. Sites that formally integrated services from multiple funding streams needed to train staff to perform the new shared service functions.

Exhibit 5-4 provides examples of the types of capacity-building activities developed within the case study sites to support the delivery of integrated One-Stop services. Training protocols varied in duration, intensity, and formality, depending on the complexity and specificity of the job to be performed. Perhaps the most intensive training curriculum was a 16-day curriculum developed by the Maryland Institute for Employment and Training Professionals to train designated individuals to function as "resource area specialists" within local One-Stop centers. A formal training curriculum was developed in Connecticut to prepare and certify staff from all 19 Job Centers as "resume writers." Training staff in resume writing skills was seen as particularly important in this state because of the advent of new technologies such as Talent Banks in which job seekers can post their resumes electronically.

A number of One-Stop sites were planning widespread training for One-Stop staff in technology skills, including general computer familiarity and training in the specific software applications available to customers in One-Stop resource rooms. For example, Connecticut began Internet training in mid-1996, to coincide with the state's development of an Internet Web site. Front-line staff dealing with customers were

## Exhibit 5-4
## Case Study Examples of Training to Support the Delivery of Integrated One-Stop Services

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | To support the delivery of high quality job search support services, the state has developed training modules based on the National Association of Resume Writers standards, and has certified approximately 30 staff from all 19 Job Centers as "resume writers." Resume training was seen as particularly timely, since new skills are required of resume writers with the advent of new technologies, such as Talent Banks, in which job seekers can post their resumes electronically.<br>The state is collaborating with the information technology staff to develop technology curriculum units for supervisors and local staff. Although substantial investments in technology have been made and reporting systems are adequate, the largest challenge is training staff in the use of technology. |
| Iowa | At the Des Moines Workforce Development Center, the agencies that have taken the lead in developing a shared Resource Center and Assessment Center have developed formal curricula to train other staff to work in these areas. Cross-training of staff from different agencies was underway at the time of the evaluation site visit to prepare individuals to staff these functions, both on a regular and back-up basis. |
| Maryland | The Maryland Institute for Employment and Training Professionals has developed an intensive 16-day curriculum to prepare individuals to function as *resource area specialists* within local One-Stop centers. This training is divided into separate modules and includes general training on customer service and interpersonal communication as well as training on different technology-based customer products. Once the training is refined, it is the state's intention to issue certificates so that individuals can be "certified" resource area specialists. |
| Minnesota | Current staff training efforts administered by the state include training on the key functions and responsibilities of "service consultants," who serve as the first point of contact at Workforce Centers. |

trained in using Netscape to access the Internet as a tool in the job search process. In Iowa, local-level staff required both immediate computer literacy training, including exposure to word processing and spread-sheet applications, and training in specific technology-based customer products.

Several sites have developed new staff training on how to help customers access and use labor market information. In Ohio, a Professional Development Institute operated by the state labor market information division will train local One-Stop staff on how to use labor market information, based on case study examples. In Minnesota, six new regional labor market analysts have conducted a number of LMI training sessions for One-Stop staff and hosted an "LMI User's Conference" to acquaint One-Stop staff with available labor market information and train staff in the use of career and occupational information software available to One-Stop customers.

### GOAL 5. TRAINING MANAGERS AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT STAFF IN NEW SKILLS NEEDED IN THE ONE-STOP SETTING

Case study sites realized early on that managers would need training in special skills to support their responsibilities in managing and overseeing customer-oriented services within integrated One-Stop systems. Specifically, managers and technical support staff needed training in (1) maintaining the information infrastructure to support technology-based customer services and One-Stop management tools and information-sharing procedures; (2) marketing One-Stop services; (3) measuring customer satisfaction and using performance data to support continuous improvement efforts; and (4) generating One-Stop revenues and allocating One-Stop costs.

The training needs of One-Stop technical support staff and One-Stop management teams were somewhat different. Technical support staff had to be able to support direct service staff in making technology-based information services available to employer and job-seeker customers. They also had to provide guidance in the use of electronic networks to input and retrieve data on labor market information, program services, customers, community resources, and program outcomes. State information technology staff have generally taken the responsibility for initiating local staff into the skills they need to keep the information technology system running smoothly.

The members of local One-Stop management teams had to learn how to develop effective marketing strategies. Since previous DOL-funded programs did not require aggressive marketing of services and programs to the general public, staff tended to have little direct experience or expertise in marketing. The new emphasis on reaching a broader customer base both for individual customers and employers requires staff to develop more sophisticated marketing skills. States have tended to provide marketing models or templates for local staff to build on in their marketing efforts.

Local One-Stop managers also needed specific training in how to measure customer satisfaction and how to use performance data for continuous improvement. Increasingly, One-Stop centers are promoting the concept of documenting performance and using performance information to support continuous improvement efforts. This is frequently an unfamiliar concept to managers, who need to learn how to set benchmarks and how to use performance indicators to identify opportunities for improvement. In Connecticut, the state planned for staff in local offices to receive training in the analytical techniques that would allow them to design supplementary local performance measures and to analyze local performance on both state-mandated and locally-initiated performance measures.

A critical skill for managers in the current One-Stop environment is the ability to use funds from multiple categorical funding streams to support the delivery of integrated One-Stop services. In Texas, a second round of regional training conferences planned at the time of the evaluation site visit focused on funding and financial management issues for One-Stop center managers.

### ANALYSIS OF CAPACITY BUILDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS, CHALLENGES, AND NEXT STEPS

The approach to capacity building taken by most of the case study sites was not to limit staff training to a few discrete skill areas but to include training in the full set of attitudes, knowledge, and skills needed to build and operate a transformed One-Stop workforce development system. Thus, in addition to addressing the specific occupational skills needed by the staff responsible for delivering One-Stop services, the capacity-building efforts of the case study sites addressed the organizational and interpersonal skills needed by One-Stop managers and staff to forge a unified One-Stop system and culture. The paradigm of total quality management, team work, and continuous improvement—borrowed from private industry—provided an extremely useful framework both for the content of the capacity-building efforts and for the procedures used to design and implement the One-Stop capacity building efforts.

One-Stop capacity building activities faced a number of challenges, including the following:

- *The need to develop a long-term capacity-building plan while also responding to the immediate technical assistance and training needs of the earliest implementation sites.* While state plans for capacity building tended to derive from a long-term view of One-Stop system-building goals, local-site technical assistance and training plans focused on how to begin delivering services in an integrated multi-agency context.
- *The need to address simultaneously the capacity building needs of the One-Stop system as a whole and the specific training requirements of the different partner agencies.* One-Stop partners most often retained their individual job descriptions, funding structures, and personnel policies, while consolidating a selected subset of One-Stop service functions.
- *The need to coordinate plans for staff training with evolving plans for other aspects of One-Stop system building.* These other aspects of system-building included marketing, the development of technology-based customer products and integrated information systems, and performance measurement and continuous improvement. To coordinate these efforts required collaboration among a number of different system-building work groups.
- *The need to balance time and resource investments in training with the demands of direct service delivery.* At the same time that staff perceived the importance of training, they were often also facing the need to respond to an increasing demand for One-Stop services and a declining resource base. One-Stop partners had to be careful to develop training schedules that would not interrupt services or overload an already overworked staff.

During their first year of One-Stop implementation efforts, many of the case study sites made notable progress in designing and implementing a capacity building approach.

- Most states and local areas had completed an assessment of staff training needs associated with One-Stop implementation.
- Most sites had developed interagency work groups to coordinate capacity building plans and take into account the priorities and resources available from all One-Stop partners.
- Most sites had identified a wide range of vehicles for the delivery of training, some drawing on existing training resources and others involving the development of new delivery strategies.

- Most sites had carefully coordinated their capacity-building strategies with related areas of One-Stop system design such as marketing, developing staffing plans and job descriptions, and performance management.
- Most sites had developed a careful balance between training designed to encourage system transformation and training designed to reassure staff who were fearful about how they would be affected by these changes.

However, it is clear that the One-Stop initiative will need to maintain an ongoing investment in staff training and institutional capacity building efforts. Lessons learned from the early implementation sites can help make training designs more relevant to the needs of the next generation of One-Stop implementation states and local sites. In addition, experienced sites and centers can provide a wide range of trainers and peer consultants to assist newly emerging local One-Stop systems.

Still requiring additional attention in most case study sites are the following concerns:

- How to make sure that staff have the technical expertise and experience to assist customers with technology-based products and services.
- How to balance and coordinate state and local training initiatives.
- How to attend to the staff development needs of managers as well as those of service delivery staff.
- How to pay for ongoing staff development and organizational capacity building efforts.
- How to measure the effectiveness of different capacity building approaches and identify needed training improvements.

# 6. FINANCING ONE-STOP SERVICES

## INTRODUCTION

The vision guiding One-Stop implementation in most study sites is of a customer-oriented system in which customer needs—rather than categorical program regulations—drive the design and delivery of workforce development services. To further this vision, One-Stop partners had to develop new financing mechanisms that could be used to support integrated services.

At the time that many of the initial Implementation Grant states were planning their One-Stop systems, it was widely expected that the 104th Congress would pass federal workforce development block grant legislation. Block grants were expected to create a consolidated funding stream that could be used to support integrated One-Stop workforce development services. In the interim, however, local One-Stop agency partners had to develop financial and non-financial coordination agreements to support the delivery of seamless customer services. Most of these approaches involved informally patching together multiple funding streams to support coordinated One-Stop services. The case study sites believed these would be temporary solutions to the problem of One-Stop financing. The failure of the proposed workforce development block grant legislation, however, has made it necessary for states to continue financing One-Stop services by piecing together resources from multiple categorical programs.

In this chapter, we review the goals that underlie the different financial arrangements developed to finance One-Stop services and the different strategies used by the case study sites to address each of these financing goals. At the end of the chapter, we summarize state and local accomplishments in financing and accounting for One-Stop costs and review what the case study sites have identified as their remaining challenges and next steps.

## GOALS OF FINANCING ONE-STOP SERVICES AND ALLOCATING COSTS

The case study sites have developed similar overall goals and objectives for financing One-Stop services and allocating system costs. These goals include the following:

1. Coordinating efforts by state and local One-Stop partners to finance One-Stop services.

2. Developing cost-sharing arrangements that blend resources from multiple funding streams to support the design and delivery of seamless workforce development services while ensuring that the expenditure, cost allocation, and reporting requirements for each categorical funding stream continue to be met.
3. Using One-Stop implementation grant funds as a catalyst to promote the initial development of One-Stop systems and services, while identifying other sources of funds for ongoing administration and delivery of One-Stop services.
4. Identifying new resources to support the development and delivery of core services to all One-Stop customers.

The fiscal arrangements that have been developed to support One-Stop operations reflect the diversity of the case study states and local sites and their differing visions of One-Stop system change. Below we describe the strategies developed by different sites to address each of these goals.

## GOAL 1. COORDINATING EFFORTS BY STATE AND LOCAL PARTNERS TO FINANCE ONE-STOP SERVICES

Many of the arrangements for sharing funds to support One-Stop operations have been worked out in detail at the local level. Nevertheless, states have played important roles in (1) encouraging the formation of integrated workforce development funding streams and budgets and supporting tests of new cost-allocation methods, and (2) influencing how Wagner-Peyser staff and funds are used within local One-Stop centers to support One-Stop operations.

### Developing Integrated One-Stop Budgets

In the absence of federal block grant legislation, most states stopped short of actually consolidating the funding of different categorical programs. These states viewed the continued existence of categorical programs as a major barrier to the formal integration of One-Stop partner programs and services.

States generally deferred to local areas in the development of informal arrangements to finance integrated One-Stop services—they encouraged these arrangements, but did not usually get involved in developing or formalizing them. At the time of the site visits, only two case-study states—Indiana and Massachusetts—had played an active role in developing an integrated budget process for local One-Stop systems:

- The Indiana Department of Workforce Development required local Private Industry Councils to develop integrated career center budgets for ES, UI, and JTPA funds using formal interagency cost-sharing agreements based on a model "integrated services contract" developed by the state.
- The MassJobs Council in Massachusetts took responsibility for developing an integrated funding stream to support pilot One-Stop career centers by convincing five state agencies to transfer a total of $10 million to the council for the operation of career centers in four selected regions. Chartered career center operators in Massachusetts were awarded integrated funds directly from the MassJobs Council.[1]

Iowa encouraged local One-Stop centers to develop integrated budgets showing how resources from multiple partner agencies were being used, but such budgets had not yet been achieved by the local case study sites at the time of the evaluation site visits. A number of other states—including Connecticut, Minnesota, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin—required local areas to develop plans for integrated One-Stop services through their own locally negotiated coordination and cost-sharing arrangements.

Since the time of the evaluation site visits, several of the first-round One-Stop implementation states have undertaken pilot projects in selected local areas to test the cost allocation principles described in the Cost Allocation Technical Assistance Guide (TAG) entitled *Sharing Resources to Provide Integrated Services: A Guide to Activity-Based Cost Allocation*. The TAG was developed by a joint federal, state, and local work group within the Department of Labor and has been approved for field testing by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, and by the relevant cost allocation offices within the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education. If they become widely accepted, the new cost allocation principles proposed in this TAG have the potential to dramatically change the formal One-Stop budgeting process in the future.[2]

---

[1] As a condition of receiving these funds, career center operators were still required to meet the eligibility and reporting requirements for each of the constituent funding streams.

[2] Following the cost-allocation methods described in the TAG, the adequacy of cost-sharing agreements is based on the relative shares of productivity outcomes received by participating programs rather than by a detailed accounting of their resource inputs. This permits different partners to contribute different types of resources and pay for different costs, as long as their bottom-line resource shares are equitable.

### Determining How Wagner-Peyser Funds Are Used to Support One-Stop Operations

Because federal Employment Service funds are administered at the state level, the lead state agencies for this program have been influential in guiding how ES staff and funds are used to support One-Stop career center operations at the local level. Eight of the case study states—Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin—have been highly supportive of the use of Wagner-Peyser funds (and, in most cases, state ES staff) for the delivery of core services within One-Stop centers.

Of these eight states, six —Connecticut, Indiana, Iowa, Ohio, Texas, and Wisconsin—promoted local flexibility and allowed substantial local control over how Wagner-Peyser staff and funds were used within One-Stop centers. States in this group generally encouraged cross-staffing and the development of integrated service delivery procedures across ES, UI, and other One-Stop partner agencies. These states allowed local partners to determine what functional roles will be played by ES, JTPA, and other staff in providing coordinated One-Stop services. Although Ohio did not mandate co-location of all partners, it encouraged (1) integrated intake through the use of a system-wide common intake procedure; (2) the use of staff cross-trained in multiple programs and able to perform broad, rather than narrow, functions; (3) electronically shared information; and (4) integrated job development and job placement services across local partners.

Two states of the eight—Massachusetts and Minnesota—were more prescriptive about how Wagner-Peyser funds should be used within One-Stop centers. Massachusetts decided that career center operators selected through a competitive procurement process should take over responsibility for the delivery of Wagner-Peyser-funded services. As a result, Massachusetts closed publicly-operated ES offices as One-Stop career centers opened for business.[3] Minnesota decided that state Job Service staff throughout the state would be automatically responsible for job development, job listings, and job matching for all One-Stop partner programs. However, local partners in Minnesota may determine how other job-seeking services and other core One-Stop services should be provided within One-Stop centers.

---

[3] Although this arrangement has been permitted to continue for the duration of the Massachusetts One-Stop implementation grant, its future is in doubt, both because of local political opposition in some sites and because of a federal debate about whether ES and UI services may be provided by private sector entities.

In contrast to the eight states described above, Maryland has been less active in ensuring that Wagner-Peyser staff and funds are used to deliver core One-Stop services. This state does not mandate co-location of ES and JTPA partners in the operation of One-Stop career centers and does not require the integration of workforce development services across different categorical programs (beyond the delivery of automated One-Stop self-access information services developed at the state level). Nevertheless, Wagner-Peyser funds were supported at least some One-Stop services in each of the local case study sites visited in Maryland.

### GOAL 2. DEVELOPING COST-SHARING ARRANGEMENTS THAT BLEND RESOURCES FROM MULTIPLE FUNDING STREAMS

Given the reality of continued categorical program funding, One-Stop practitioners have had to develop cost allocation practices that adhere to the eligibility and expenditure limitations established for each separate funding stream while supporting the delivery of seamless customer services.

In developing cost-allocation arrangements, the use of formal financial agreements was the exception, rather than the rule, among One-Stop partners at the time of the evaluation site visits. Instead, non-financial service coordination agreements and informal cost-sharing arrangements were widespread. In this section, we discuss the different formal and informal approaches developed by the case study sites to allocate shared facilities and service costs.

#### Allocating the Cost of Shared One-Stop Facilities and Equipment

Exhibit 6-1 provides examples of some of the arrangements developed by the case study sites to allocate the costs of shared One-Stop facilities and equipment. Agencies that shared facilities on a full-time basis often developed formal lease agreements with each other to allocate shared facilities and equipment costs, particularly if one partner agency was the primary lease-holder or building owner. Where a third party owned or managed the One-Stop facility, some local partners negotiated shared leases, while others maintained separate leases for adjacent spaces to simplify the cost allocation process—even after they tore down the physical walls between the two spaces.

## Exhibit 6-1
## Case Study Examples of Allocating Shared Facilities and Equipment Costs

| | |
|---|---|
| Indiana | In the Lawrenceburg, Indiana Workforce Development Center, core partners (ES, UI, JTPA) share the costs of the One-Stop facility. Because these agencies benefit from the on-site presence of other agencies (including a full-time ABE/GED instructor, VR staff, and Senior Community Service Program staff), they do not charge any rent to these agencies. The welfare-to-work agency—located next door to the center—pays for shared use of the center's conference room and classroom space.<br>In both Indiana local case study sites, the agencies responsible for JTPA and ES/UI have entered into "integrated services contracts" in which they agree to exchange resources in payment for shared facilities and service costs. Shared costs are allocated at the local network level, rather than the individual center level. Shared costs include office space and telephones, as well as management and administrative costs. |
| Iowa | In the Creston Workforce Development Center, the center space is paid for with two separate lease agreements held by the ES and JTPA partners. JTPA and VR staff are housed on one side of the facility and Job Service staff on the other. In the middle are programs with multiple agency involvement, such as welfare-to-work and Worker Profiling and Reemployment Services. Shared spaces include an employee cafeteria, shared supply rooms, and a shared classroom space. |
| Minnesota | In-kind contributions of equipment, furniture, furnishings, and library materials were made by several of the agencies that share use of the resource room within the One-Stop career center in Anoka County, Minnesota. |
| Ohio | Pursuant to a state requirement for local cost-sharing through in-kind contributions, multiple partners in the Lucas and Wood county systems contributed supplies and facilities costs. During the second year of One-Stop operations in the Wood County Employment Resource Center, the cost of telephones and office supplies will be prorated across all on-site partners. |

**Exhibit 6-1** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Texas | At the Lake Jackson Career Center, staff responsible for the ES/UI and JTPA programs maintain separate rental agreements for their adjacent office space, even though they are employed by the same state agency, because of the need to account for their separate categorical funding streams. The One-Stop implementation grant made it possible, for the first time, to purchase a fax machine and copier that are officially for use by all Center customers.<br>At the Arlington Career Center, the JTPA agency—the primary lease holder—charges only the VR agency for the space it occupies on a full-time basis. Other agencies that out-station staff on a part-time or full-time basis receive free space because of the value they return to the JTPA agency by making their services available to JTPA clients. All partners have contributed equipment, software, and other materials to the shared resource room, career library, and learning center. |
| Wisconsin | All on-site partners in the Waukesha County Workforce Development Center pay for shared facilities, equipment, and a shared "center operations manager" position through individual lease agreements with a neutral third-party owner.<br>An assessment center shared by several partner agencies within the local Waukesha County Workforce Development Center was furnished using in-kind contributions from four different agencies. |

Where staff from one local agency were out-stationed part-time to space occupied full-time by another agency, formal cost-sharing arrangements were less commonly used. Rather than formally allocating facilities and equipment costs across the participating agencies, it was often determined that the benefit to the host agency from the on-site presence of staff from the guest agency was a fair exchange of value for the free space provided. However, in one case—at the Arlington Career Center in Arlington, Texas—an agency receiving free classroom space was expected to reserve a certain number of free slots for the host agency's JTPA clients in on-site classes.

Financing and allocating costs for the furbishing and equipping of shared activity areas within One-Stop career centers—including reception areas, resource rooms, career libraries, lunchrooms, classroom areas, and other spaces open to all One-Stop partners—were often made by asking several different local on-site partners for in-kind contributions or by expending One-Stop implementation grant funds. For example, to furnish a shared assessment center in the Des Moines Workforce Development Center, the community college provided the carpeting, the Job Corps administrator arranged for the carpet installation, the ES agency provided the glue for the carpet, and the JTPA administrative entity traded in some old furniture to get modular wall dividers to separate the assessment center from the surrounding space. To renovate a shared reception area in the same center, One-Stop implementation grant funds were used.

Allocating expenditures for shared equipment and supplies used in the day-to-day operation of One-Stop career centers was often difficult under existing cost allocation arrangements. Investing in the installation of new integrated telephone systems was particularly problematic in a number of the case study sites. As a result, One-Stop implementation grant funds were used to finance new telephone systems in at least three of the sites visited. Implementation grants were also used for shared equipment.

In some instances, one of the partner agencies (often the Wagner-Peyser agency) agreed to finance the development of the physical facility and supplies for a One-Stop resource room that would be available to all One-Stop center customers. For example, in Des Moines, Iowa, the ES program agreed to use Wagner-Peyser funds to pay for and equip the resource room in the local Workforce Development Center if staff from other agencies would agree to help staff the room and assist One-Stop customers.

Over time, the partners in local One-Stop centers appeared to become more comfortable with formal cost allocation agreements. For example, by the second year of One-Stop operations in the Wood County Employment Resource Center in Ohio, all on-site partners agreed to share in the prorated costs of telephones and office supplies. Another reason for the increased use of more flexible cost-allocation schemes by the second year of the implementation grants was the impact of the DOL Cost Allocation Technical Assistance Guide: it helped spread the notion that local One-Stop partners could make contributions that were equal in value *across all expense categories* rather than *within each individual expense category*.

### Allocating the Labor Costs of Shared One-Stop Services

One-Stop systems have developed three types of cost allocation approaches to pay for the labor costs of shared services. Each of these approaches is discussed below.

#### Developing Specialized Service Functions by Agency

To avoid duplication of effort and improve service coordination, a number of local One-Stop partners have developed formal or informal agreements about their mutual service delivery roles and responsibilities. In most cases, these agreements do not require the mingling of funds across different categorical funding streams. They range from descriptions of the existing relationships among categorical programs to the re-allocation of shared functions among partners.

In case study sites using a "no wrong door" approach—where co-location of local One-Stop partners is not required—interagency agreements often did little to transform service delivery roles beyond ensuring that staff from each program were provided with improved information about the services available from other programs and improved guidelines for referring customers to other services. For example, the Wood County (Ohio) Employment Resources Center emphasizes coordinated referrals rather than integrated services among its One-Stop partners. The strategy for serving participants with special needs, such as welfare recipients or individuals with disabilities, is to ensure that they are referred to the agency or agencies that specialize in their needs. Similarly, Maryland requires only that core local One-Stop partners establish "articulated referral agreements" rather than integrated operations. Thus, at the Columbia (Maryland) Career Center there was no effort to consolidate or integrate funding streams to pay for shared services at the time of the evaluation site visit even though the agency partners responsible for JTPA and ES/UI are co-located.[4]

In contrast, case study sites in Minnesota and Wisconsin developed designs for agency specialization by service function—rather than by categorical program—as part of a clear strategy to integrate One-Stop services. Service integration at the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center, for example, was developed around seven different generic service functions: reception, assessment, case management, employer services, planning, labor market information, and job search assistance and training. In planning for the transition to One-Stop service delivery, each of the local partners agreed to specialize in one or more of these functions.[5] Following a similar strategy, One-Stop career centers in Minnesota are required to integrate One-Stop services by functional service area (these areas include intake, eligibility determination, assessment, case management, and job development and placement). The state encourages local One-Stop partners to develop service delivery roles that enable each agency to "concentrate on what it does best." However, by state fiat, the local ES is automatically responsible for job development, job listings, and job matching services.

In Wisconsin and Minnesota, agencies generally provided specialized services that were authorized by each agency's own legislative mandate. As a result, no formal cost allocation arrangements were required. However, in some sites, agencies were designated to provide services for which they did not already have authority or funding. In these instances, *formal service delivery contracts* were awarded to provide the authorization or increase the funding available to the agency that had been designated as the service provider for that function. For example, in the Anoka County (Minnesota) Workforce Center, the JTPA agency was awarded a contract from the welfare department to enhance its capacity to provide employment and training services to participants in welfare-to-work programs. In the Waukesha County Center in

---

[4] In contrast, at the Baltimore (Maryland) Eastside Career Center, a higher degree of consolidated service delivery across the local ES/UI and JTPA partners was accomplished through cross-staffing of shared services, as described below.

[5] The local economic development agency agreed to take the lead role in employer services; Job Service agreed to take the lead role in reception, job information, and self-assisted services; and the local community college agreed to operate a "community career center" to provide assessment and career information services to all One-Stop customers.

Wisconsin, the local community college was awarded a consolidated service contract from the JOBS and JTPA administrative agencies to provide assessment and career information services to customers enrolled in these two categorical programs. This funding was supplemented by funding from the community college's own budget, which enabled the center to offer assessment and career information services to the general public at no charge.

In One-Stop centers in which the JTPA agency was designated to play a major role in the delivery of core One-Stop services—e.g., supervising resource rooms, providing career planning workshops, or offering job search training—a potential cost-allocation problem arose because JTPA funds cannot be expended on behalf of non-JTPA eligible customers. Some case study sites that used JTPA funds to provide information services to all One-Stop customers justified these expenditures as JTPA outreach and pre-enrollment services. Other sites indicated that such services were available to non-JTPA clients only on a "space available" basis. A number of sites had a difficult time identifying "gap funding" to cover the cost of offering JTPA services to the general public. In the absence of other funding sources, local One-Stop centers in New London, Connecticut, and Anoka County, Minnesota, used One-Stop implementation grant funds to help cover the staff costs of making resource room services available to the general public.

### Cross-Staffing Shared Functions

While some One-Stop career centers developed integrated service delivery systems in which different agencies took on different service delivery functions (as described above) other sites reduced duplication of effort through "cross-staffing" shared service functions. In cross-staffing arrangements, staff from multiple agencies were assigned to a consolidated service team whose members provided integrated One-Stop services and received integrated supervision. Among the case study sites, most cross-staffing arrangements were pursued informally, without pooling categorical program funds or developing formal interagency cost-allocation plans.

Cross-staffing arrangements have been developed as a convenient way for multiple One-Stop partners to contribute to the costs of shared services. Unlike service specialization by agency—which emphasizes the differences in the training, skills, and roles performed by staff from different agencies—cross-staffing of shared functions depends on cross-training staff in common procedures and helps develop a common identity, shared work culture, and uniform service procedures across One-Stop staff from the participating agencies. Cross-staffing for some One-Stop services is fully compatible with developing specialized agency responsibilities for the delivery of other services.

Among the case study sites, cross-staffing was frequently used for services designed to be available to all One-Stop customers. For example, in the New London (Connecticut) Career Center, ES, UI, and JTPA employees cross-staff a number of key service positions, including customer "greeter" and resource librarian. Both agencies also contribute staff to the career service center, where they currently offer to the general public a range of group workshops, self-assisted services, and one-on-one staffed career counseling services.

Cross-staffing arrangements are also being tested in some sites to as a way to allow the consolidation of more intensive services—such as case management or detailed assessment services—reserved for customers eligible for one of several categorical funding streams. For example, in the Des Moines Workforce Development Center, a number of local One-Stop partners (including the agencies responsible for welfare-to-work, JTPA, dislocated worker services, and the community college) have agreed to cross-staff an assessment center to which each participating agency can refer its customers. As long as staff from an agency participate in staffing the assessment center, that agency can refer its clients for assessments at no additional charge.

### Paying Individual One-Stop Staff From Multiple Funding Streams

Another approach to financing integrated services is for individual One-Stop staff members to bill their time to two or more funding streams. Although billing staff time to multiple funding streams is not uncommon when the same agency controls all the relevant funding streams, it is more challenging when different agencies are responsible for the different funding streams. Nonetheless, several local One-Stop systems developed such procedures.

In a number of case study sites, an important barrier to integrating services such as Vocational Rehabilitation and Veterans Employment Services within the One-Stop setting is the requirement for these programs to have "dedicated" full-time staff whose only responsibility is to serve individuals eligible for the particular program. Whether or not they were authorized to deviate from the standard full-time staffing assignments, several case study sites found that *developing split-time work assignments* for these staff—so that they can work part-time for a program with narrow eligibility requirements and part-time for a program that serves the general public—has clear advantages in the One-Stop setting. For example, at the time of the evaluation site visit, a Veterans Employment and Training Services (VETS) representative had recently moved to working half-time on VETS responsibilities and half-time on general ES responsibilities in the Lawrenceburg, Indiana, Career Center. Because it allowed this individual to perform any function within the One-Stop office, this arrangement was perceived by the individual staff member as well as by other One-Stop staff as contributing to an improvement in the quality of services available to veterans.

When two different agencies controlled different funding streams, *service delivery contracts* between the two agencies allowed a single agency to remain the employer of a given individual, even though that person's job was funded from two different categorical programs. An example from the Indianapolis One-Stop network illustrates this procedure. Following a pattern established at the state level, the JTPA and ES/UI agencies in the Indianapolis One-Stop network contracted to reimburse each other for the costs of delivering services authorized under the other agency's programs. As a result of these "integrated services contracts," ES/UI and JTPA staff at the local level are able to provide services available under all three programs. Individual staff, including center managers, can bill hours across multiple categorical programs based on how they actually spend their time.[6] Similarly, in Massachusetts, the development of Interagency Service Agreements between the MassJobs Council and five different state agencies has permitted chartered career center operators to provide services with an integrated career center staff using funds allocated from each of these programs.

### GOAL 3. USING ONE-STOP IMPLEMENTATION GRANT FUNDS AS A CATALYST

In many of the case study sites, the federal One-Stop implementation grant provided the only funding sorce that was not tied to the client eligibility, expenditure, and reporting requirements of a specific categorical program. Although the level of One-Stop implementation grant funds was usually insignificant in comparison to the overall costs of providing One-Stop services. One-Stop implementation grants—together with Wagner-Peyser funds, which were among the most flexible of the categorical program funds—took on special significance as the catalyst or the "glue" that held the entire One-Stop system transformation effort together.

---

[6] Since the time of the evaluation site visit, the Indianapolis network has begun pilot testing the DOL Cost Allocation TAG which enables a wider range of local partner agencies to participate in formal cost sharing arrangements and which changes the basis for cost sharing from resource inputs to planned performance outputs.

As described in Exhibit 6-2, states often reserved substantial portions of their One-Stop implementation grants at the state level to support the development of automated job banks, talent banks, and user-friendly automated information about labor markets, careers, and education and training opportunities. Developing shared management information systems and performance management systems and the electronic infrastructure to support information sharing and technology-based customer services was also viewed as a high priority state-level investment that was essential to building One-Stop capacity at the state and local levels. State-level implementation grants frequently supported staff development and training initiatives as well.

States varied in the amount of One-Stop implementation grant funding they awarded to local areas to support local One-Stop implementation efforts and in the way they distributed these funds. Some states (e.g., Wisconsin and Maryland) provided all local service delivery areas with small One-Stop system-building grants, while others made a first round of local One-Stop grant awards to "pilot" local sites that were selected through a competitive process or that were judged to be "ready for implementation" and followed these with subsequent grants to second-phase implementation sites.

States usually required local areas to submit detailed proposals for the use of the One-Stop Implementation Grant funds and encouraged local areas to use funds for one-time system transformation projects for which no other funds were available, rather than for ongoing staff or operations costs. As described in Exhibit 6-3, the local case study sites used their implementation grants for a variety of activities, including the following:

- Remodeling shared One-Stop facilities, including removing walls that had previously divided space occupied by staff from different agencies and enlarging or combining reception areas to permit the delivery of consolidated reception services.
- Purchasing and installing new telephone and communications equipment to link multiple local One-Stop sites within local systems and permit staff from different sites and different agencies to share information and communicate more easily.

## Exhibit 6-2
## Investment of One-Stop Implementation Grant Funds in State-Level Projects

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | In Connecticut, about 60% of the One-Stop implementation grant was retained at the state level, where funds were used to upgrade the technology infrastructure and develop automated customer products, including labor market information, occupational information, a Talent Bank for listing job seeker resumes, the state's Internet Web site (which includes links to America's Job Bank), and information kiosks.<br>Additionally, the state's share of the implementation grant was used for staff development, the development of a performance measurement system, marketing, and the provision of financial incentives to state partner agencies as part of the negotiation of formal interagency agreements. |
| Indiana | The state retained 80% of the One-Stop grant at the state level to support the development of the infrastructure for automated customer services and an automated information support system. A number of other resources streams were also used to support these functions; overall investments in the state's automated job listing system were estimated at $10 million.<br>The state also expended implementation-grant funds to support capacity building and staff development efforts. |
| Iowa | The state retained 66% of the One-Stop implementation grant at the state level for use in developing an automated information system (including integrated intake and eligibility and integrated case tracking).<br>State funds were also used for staff development, marketing, and networking with other states. |
| Maryland | The state retained 95% of the federal implementation grant funds at the state level for the development of the CareerNet infrastructure, automated services, and technical support. |

**Exhibit 6-2** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Massachusetts | The portion of the One-Stop implementation grant that has been used for state projects has been used as seed money to support the operation of the state Career Center office, develop the statewide information technology system (disseminated via the state's Web site on the Internet), develop marketing and staff development materials, and provide technical assistance to localities. |
| Minnesota | During the first year of One-Stop implementation, the state retained about half of the implementation grant funds to support state-level marketing efforts, implement technology improvements, and support the development of improved labor market information. During the second year, only about one-fourth of the grant funds supported these same functions. |
| Ohio | The state retained 65% of the federal implementation grant for use in enhancing labor market information, producing automated labor exchange work stations, creating an integrated customer information system, conducting research and evaluation, and managing the state network. |
| Texas | The state retained 25% of its implementation grant at the state level for investments in the technology infrastructure and the development of labor market information, career information, wage information, and other technology-based customer products, financial systems, and performance evaluation systems. |
| Wisconsin | The state kept 30% of its One-Stop implementation grant at the state level to support a range of system-building activities, including refining the automated JobNet job listing system. |

## Exhibit 6-3
## Case Study Examples of How Local One-Stop Implementation Grants were Used

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | In the New London Career Center, the local One-Stop implementation grant was used to purchase a new telephone system, purchase other equipment, and develop a new communication infrastructure. In addition, implementation grant funds were used to pay for expanding the menu of universal core services to include individual career counseling, group workshops, and resume preparation services. |
| Indiana | Within the Indianapolis One-Stop network, implementation funds were used to purchase books, videos, and software for the information resource areas; train staff; and install a sophisticated telephone system to support information sharing among the three centers. One center used much of its share for remodeling its facility. |
| Iowa | The Creston Workforce Development Center used most of its grant to remodel its new facility by removing a wall between two spaces and installing a new phone system.<br>The Des Moines Workforce Development Center used its grant to remodel its customer reception desk and furbish a shared assessment center. |
| Maryland | In the Baltimore Career Center network, the $20,000 planning grant was used to support the development of an integrated interagency customer appointment scheduling system. |
| Minnesota | In the Anoka County Workforce Center, the local implementation grant was used to remodel the physical facility by removing walls between the spaces occupied by different partner agencies, purchasing materials and equipment for the shared resource center and computer rooms, and helping support the costs of staff providing resource room services. |
| Ohio | In Lucas and Wood counties, the implementation grant funds were used to support cross-training for partner agency staff; purchase computers, network equipment to support automated information services, and an information kiosk; and support center marketing efforts. |

**Exhibit 6-3** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Texas | In the Lake Jackson Career Center, $30,000 in local implementation funds were used to renovate the physical facility by removing a wall; purchase computers, software, videos, and reference books for a shared resource room; and arrange for fax and copy machines to be available to all center customers.<br>Implementation grant funds received by Tarrant County (which contains seven One-Stop centers) were used to purchase computer equipment and software and video materials for use by the general public. Funds were also used to support the development of a county-wide information system. |

- Purchasing equipment, supplies, and multi-media reference materials to furbish and equip One-Stop career libraries and resource rooms to serve the general public.
- Purchasing and installing computers or kiosks to provide automated information services to the general public. Cross-training staff to perform new or broader functions within One-Stop centers.
- Cross-training staff to perform new or broader functions within One-Stop centers.
- Supporting center marketing efforts.
- Paying for a center receptionist and center manager.
- Providing "gap funding" for the increased staff costs associated with expanding access to the general public for group workshops and individual services previously provided only to categorically-eligible customers.

Of these activities, the last two involve paying ongoing staff costs and are thus problematic because they are not time-limited transitional costs of One-Stop implementation. They raise the question of how One-Stop systems will continue to support universal One-Stop services after the implementation grant funding is exhausted.

Although One-Stop implementation grants have been extremely useful in helping states and local sites develop the infrastructure to support One-Stop operations, the level of funding provided is clearly not sufficient to accomplish the entire system-building effort. In addition to developing cost-allocation procedures that enable existing categorical funds to be used to support One-Stop system development and operations, a number of the case study sites have identified additional sources of funding to support the development and ongoing delivery of universal One-Stop services.

### GOAL 4. IDENTIFYING ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES TO SUPPORT UNIVERSAL CORE SERVICES

The case study sites obtained several key types of additional financial support for their One-Stop systems. These included (1) loans and grants from local government entities and foundations; (2) additional federal grants whose objectives are overlapping and consistent with the One-Stop initiative; and (3) contributions made by volunteer staff and community-based agencies. In addition, although the goal of generating revenues from user fees was not usually realized during the first year of One-Stop implementation, most sites are eager to develop "enhanced" One-Stop services that will be supported by revenues from fees paid by the job seekers, employed workers, and businesses who use these services.

### Obtaining State and Local Government Support and Foundation Grants

In a number of cases, the development of One-Stop career centers has received strong financial support from local governments. In the following instances, the use of local government funds allowed One-Stop systems to obtain new or substantially renovated facilities in which multiple local partners were co-located.

- In Waukesha County, Wisconsin, strong support from local elected officials convinced the county technical college—one of the key local One-Stop partners—to provide $2.3 million for the construction of a Workforce Development Center on the college campus. To ensure that all local partners are treated fairly by a neutral landlord, the building is formally owned by the technical college foundation board, which negotiates leases with all nine on-site partner agencies.
- The building that houses the Anoka County (Minnesota) Workforce Center is located in a park-like setting on ten acres donated by the city of Blaine. The Workforce Center facility was developed as part of a Human Service Center that houses 25 public and non-profit agencies. After acquiring the land through a tax sale, the city issued tax-exempt revenue bonds to finance construction of the facility. The building will be owned by Anoka County after the municipal bonds are retired. Because the building is publicly owned, rental costs are lower than those in comparable commercial sites.
- In Tarrant County, Texas, the Arlington Career Center has received strong political support from both city and county officials. Reflecting this support, the city of Arlington has set aside $1.3 million in local Community Development Block Grant funds to help pay for the renovation of a career center facility.

State and local government funds were also used to pay for services. For example, in Anoka County, Minnesota, the county contributes funds that make One-Stop services available to all center customers. Within the Eastside Career Center in Baltimore, Maryland, state funds were provided to expand a federal Career Management Accounts (CMA) grant to fund training vouchers for economically-disadvantaged individuals as well as dislocated workers. By combining these two funding sources, the demonstration project became a model for providing training assistance to all categorically eligible groups within the One-Stop center.

Private foundations have also contributed substantial financial support to One-Stop career centers in a few sites. The Minnesota Career Center in Anoka County has received significant financial support from private sector charitable and foundation sources as well as public sources. The McKnight Foundation provided funds that were used to assist agencies in relocating to the new center, and the United Way of the Minneapolis area has donated $500,000 over five years to help pay for program operations. Another local One-Stop system that has succeeding in attracting foundation support is the Indianapolis Network for Employment and Training (iNET), which received an $800,000 2-year grant from the Rockefeller and Mott Foundations to explore innovative ways to address the service needs of welfare recipients.

### Brokering Additional Federal Funds to Support One-Stops

In several case study sites, local agencies responsible for JTPA program funds described themselves as being "entrepreneurs" or "brokers" accumulating funds from a variety of additional federal sources to support the implementation of the local One-Stop vision. Funds that were identified by the case study sites as being extremely useful in supporting the development of comprehensive customer-oriented workforce development services included the following:

- One-Stop Local Learning Laboratory Grants, which had been received by three of the 14 local case study sites. The additional funds provided to local learning lab sites were used to support the further development of One-Stop systems and procedures, including the development and systemization of local resource libraries in two centers in one Learning Lab site.
- Youth Fair Chance grants, which had been received by two local case study sites to develop partnerships between schools and community organizations as a way of improving services and outcomes for local youth.
- Empowerment Zone funding, administered by the Mayor's Office of Employment Development in Baltimore—in combination with a number of other funding sources—which was used to create a network of neighborhood centers designed to link individuals from high poverty areas to One-Stop workforce development services.
- State and local School-to-Work implementation grants, which offered a number of opportunities to link services to youth and services to adults in supporting local workforce development objectives.

### Providing Services with Volunteer Staff or Public Program Trainees

In several of the case study sites, local One-Stop partners have arranged to use older workers participating in Title V of the Older Americans Act as "resource guides" to help One-Stop customers use automated career center information services or to provide center reception services. Another center is considering using volunteers to provide services to clients not eligible for categorical programs.

### Charging User Fees for Enhanced Job Seeker Services

At the time of the evaluation site visits, staff in a number of One-Stop career centers indicated that they were seriously considering charging for enhanced services to job seekers not eligible for categorical programs, but few had put these plans into practice yet. Centers were considering charging the general public for the following services:

- Job search and job retention seminars.
- The dissemination of job-search-related publications and instructional materials developed by the center.
- Resume writing classes or resume preparation assistance.
- Specialized assessment, beyond core services.
- Success skills training.
- On-site basic skills instruction.
- Advanced computer literacy classes.

Although many centers were interested in offering enhanced job-seeker services for a fee, few of the case study sites had completed detailed marketing studies to assess the demand for these services or the ability of the center to compete with private sector providers of similar services. The CareerNet Center in Springfield, Massachusetts, had conducted the most detailed marketing analysis.[7] This One-Stop center had identified three potential purchasers of enhanced individual services: (1) individuals who want to pay for such services out-of-pocket; (2) agencies who want to purchase services on behalf of their clients; and (3) employers who want to purchase services on behalf of current or prospective employees

---

[7] This center is required to share a portion of all user fees it generates with its Regional Employment Board in lieu of paying a fixed annual licensing fee for its charter to operate the career center.

At the time of the evaluation site visits, fees had actually been established for job seeker services in only two case study sites. The Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center charged a $15 tuition fee for its resume writing services. The CareerNet Center in Springfield, Massachusetts, had developed a fee schedule for *specialized assessment (*such as the Myers-Briggs personality test or certification for specific skill-sets) and s*uccess skills training*, rooted in the SCANS skills, which is oriented to customers who are changing careers entirely or are employed by firms that are implementing team-based management practices.

### Charging User Fees for Enhanced Employer Services

One-Stop partners have had somewhat more experience offering enhanced fee-based services to employers. For example, community colleges often have experience providing customized training to local employers for a fee. The two main challenges in developing user fees for enhanced employer services were (1) how to develop a menu of enhanced One-Stop services that would not duplicate services already offered by local One-Stop partners or private-sector service providers, and (2) how to convince partners that the revenues from such services should be used to finance the operation of the One-Stop center as a whole.

At least five of the fourteen local One-Stop centers visited for the evaluation have established, or are planning to establish, fee-based services for employers as a part of their overall menu of One-Stop services. The services offered (or planned to be offered) in these centers include the following:

- Large-scale recruitment and on-site customized assessment of job applicants.
- Formal screening of job applicants.
- Consulting on management issues.
- Intensive job task analysis.
- Customized analysis of labor market information for businesses interested in relocation.
- Provision of customized training to current or new employees.
- Specialized workshops for employers on topics such as work-related issues, requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and regulations governing unemployment insurance.

### ANALYSIS OF FUNDING AND COST ALLOCATION ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Because efforts to consolidate the delivery of customer services across local One-Stop partners and funding streams varied widely, the cost-allocation challenges also varied from site to site. At one extreme, some sites pursued service delivery designs that called for coordinated rather than shared services. In these sites, the One-Stop funding and cost-allocation challenges were limited to supporting the delivery of universal core services that complemented existing program-based services. The One-Stop initiative in these sites focused on providing integrated core One-Stop services to the general public, while coordinating the referral of eligible customers to categorical programs for specialized or intensive services. In some of these sites, uncertainty about cost-allocation practices and fears of disallowed costs contributed to a dampening of local enthusiasm for developing more fully-integrated One-Stop service designs.

At the other extreme, some case study sites pursued a strategy of involving as many agencies and funding streams as possible in the coordinated funding and delivery of One-Stop services in order to maximize both the level of available resources and the range of services available to One-Stop customers. In these sites, the financing of One-Stop services evolved into an effort to achieve integrated planning and budgeting for all publicly-funded education, training, and job placement services in the local area. In these "inclusive" One-Stop systems, One-Stop centers were viewed as the entry point to all publicly-funded services and the system was viewed as encompassing all services available from publicly funded workforce development programs.

A number of case study sites fell somewhere between these two extremes. They used the formation of One-Stop centers to initiate the delivery of shared core services to universal customers but worked toward greater consolidation of categorical program services and identities over time. Most sites started One-Stop implementation rather cautiously, by creating a few shared "front-end" services—such as reception, orientation, and eligibility determination—and gradually expanded service consolidation to include additional shared services over time.

Whatever the extent of shared services, local One-Stop partners in most of the case study sites arranged for the delivery of shared One-Stop services through informal or non-financial agreements about their mutual service delivery roles, rather than through formal merging of funds from multiple categorical programs.

Most of the case study sites accomplished a great deal in the realm of funding during the first year of One-Stop implementation. As a whole, these accomplishments include the following:

- The development of a variety of arrangements for financing shared One-Stop services, ranging from creating specialized service roles for different agencies, to cross-staffing consolidated service delivery units.
- The strategic use of One-Stop implementation grants at the state level to create technology-based products and design and install information technology networks that support program administration and the delivery of automated customer services.
- The strategic use of One-Stop implementation awards at the local level to link local One-Stop partners and geographic service sites, create shared facilities through the remodeling of existing spaces, and furbish and equip shared resource rooms for use by the general public.
- The identification of a wide range of additional funding sources to support the development of integrated local workforce development systems.

Despite these accomplishments, the One-Stop financing and cost-allocation arrangements developed by the case study sites during their initial implementation year were unstable in several respects.

First, in only a few instances did partners carefully analyze either the level of resource inputs made by local One-Stop partners or the system outputs enjoyed by customers eligible for different categorical program funds. Most of the case study sites had not yet created (even for planning purposes) system-wide or center-wide budgets. Instead, the operating principle was usually "bring what resources you can to the table and we'll see what we can accomplish together." The informality of these arrangements may have been necessary at the outset, but a more formal analysis of One-Stop financing might lead to more stable financial partnerships among One-Stop partners.

Second, the informality of the cost-sharing arrangements may have disguised substantial cost allocation problems. This may have occurred, for example, when funding streams with specific participant eligibility requirements (such as JOBS and JTPA) were used—in combination with other funding streams—to support services to the general public. One of the major challenges faced by the One-Stop implementation sites was the paucity of funds available to pay for group workshops and individual counseling services for individuals not eligible for any categorical program. As described above, many case study sites were able to cope with this problem, but their solutions were generally temporary or unstable.

Third, the financial arrangements in general seem both temporary and patchwork in nature, rather than designed for the long-term. This is not surprising, given that most of the sites had expected passage of workforce development blockgrant legislation and resulting initiation of integrated funding streams. However, because the future of workforce development block grants is uncertain, at best, it is now time to develop a more thoughtful plan for ongoing financing of One-Stop services. Perhaps the greatest need is for more substantial and permanent "gap financing" to build meaningful general-public services. Local and state governments and community colleges may be key to providing the needed resources. Wagner-Peyser funding will also continue to be essential as the glue that holds the entire One-Stop enterprise together.

Among the challenges and next steps that need to be addressed in both state and local One-Stop systems are the following:

- Identifying continued funding sources to operate One-Stop career centers after the implementation grant period is over.
- Continuing to explore the strategy of using fees paid by job seekers and firms to fill the gap in funding One-Stop services available to the general public.
- Using the principles in the DOL Cost Allocation Technical Assistance Guide to develop formal One-Stop cost allocation plans.
- Developing a strategy for allocating limited One-Stop resources to address the varied needs of One-Stop customers, who range from dislocated workers with substantial skills to individuals with limited education and work experience.

# 7. MARKETING ONE-STOP SYSTEMS

## INTRODUCTION

During the first year of One-Stop implementation, the case study sites faced a wide variety of system-building challenges—building state and local partnerships, developing appropriate physical facilities, designing user-friendly information systems to support self-service delivery, and integrating staff from multiple agencies within One-Stop career centers. In the context of these challenges, the marketing of One-Stop services was often put on the back burner, even though marketing was widely perceived as critical to the ultimate success of One-Stop systems. In a number of sites, however, marketing to *internal* customers was given a higher priority than marketing to *external* customers. External marketing was viewed as an activity that could be deferred until system transformation in other areas was well underway, whereas marketing to *internal* customers was viewed as an essential part of the system-building process. At the time of the evaluation site visits, therefore, internal marketing had in many cases already received substantial attention, while external One-Stop marketing was often still in its early developmental stages.

In this chapter, we discuss the key similarities and differences across the case study sites in (1) One-Stop marketing objectives, (2) the specific activities undertaken during the first year of One-Stop implementation to further each of the marketing objectives, and (3) the accomplishments achieved by the case study sites and planned next steps in marketing One-Stop systems.

## GOALS OF MARKETING EFFORTS

Realizing the vision of a transformed system supported by an array of workforce development agency partners requires the development of new marketing goals and strategies at the state and local levels. Most of the case study sites developed both short- and long-term marketing goals.

The goals most commonly identified include the following:

1. Coordinating the marketing roles played by different One-Stop partners.
2. Promoting the One-Stop vision among internal One-Stop partners.
3. Marketing the overall One-Stop system to external customers.
4. Marketing specific One-Stop services and products.

5. Reaching out to an expanded customer base.
6. Linking One-Stop marketing efforts to promotional efforts for related workforce initiatives such as school-to-work, welfare-to-work, and economic development.

In most of the case study sites, both state and local One-Stop partners were interested in furthering each of these marketing objectives. One of the most difficult challenges during the first implementation year was to clarify the roles and responsibilities of marketing teams at each level and to ensure that state and local marketing efforts and timetables were coordinated.

### Goal 1. Coordinating the Marketing Roles Played by Different One-Stop Partners

At both the state and local levels, it was important to coordinate the marketing roles played by the different agencies involved in the One-Stop system. Interagency state and local marketing teams were often formed to identify the marketing concerns of different agencies and develop a unified marketing strategy for the One-Stop system as a whole. Marketing One-Stop services to employers was frequently identified as a high-priority issue for team attention by many partners, although it was often deferred until a menu of enhanced employer services had been developed. State and local marketing committees were also usually charged with identifying a unified identity and logo to be used in marketing the state or local One-Stop system to the general public.

An important challenge for the case study sites was working out how to balance and coordinate the marketing roles played by state-level One-Stop partners with those played by local-level partners. While states often wanted to develop an overarching identity in order to provide citizens with a way to identify One-Stop centers across the state, local sites were usually concerned with marketing their particular local One-Stop partnership. In addition, states were more likely to delay their large-scale marketing campaigns until it was determined that the system could handle the demands generated by the marketing effort, while local sites often felt a pressing need to quickly provide their local communities with specific information about the new One-Stop system. This tension between local concerns and state concerns often resulted in frustration at local sites. These sites were eager to begin to marketing their new services, but state marketing plans and products had not yet been finalized.

Because of the One-Stop emphasis on reaching out to an expanded employer and job-seeker customer base, state and local One-Stop marketing goals, and the activities planned to realize them, were substantially more ambitious than any that had previously existed within public workforce development agencies. Staff at both the state and local level often lacked the marketing experience and sophisticated marketing "know-how" needed to plan and execute the large scale promotional campaigns that were required. Thus, in order to design and carry out a coherent marketing strategy, case study sites often utilized assistance from private-sector marketing consultants.

Exhibit 7-1 summarizes the different marketing roles played by state One-Stop partners in selected case study sites. State marketing activities often included the following:

- *Designing a statewide logo, name, and marketing slogan* required to be used by all local career centers to give the state's One-Stop system a clear identity in the minds of job-seeker and employer customers.
- *Developing statewide marketing materials* (e.g., brochures, television campaigns, videos) that describe the statewide One-Stop system, its service philosophy, and the common features of One-Stop services available at career centers throughout the state.
- *Developing guides, templates, and sample marketing materials* that could be adapted by local areas for designing "grand openings" for career centers, and for producing local One-Stop newsletters or local brochures oriented to employer or job-seeker customers.
- *Providing funds or in-kind contributions* to support local marketing efforts.

### Goal 2. Promoting the One-Stop Vision among Internal One-Stop Partners

Building consensus among agency partners and their staff about the One-Stop approach, philosophy, and methods was one of the most important marketing objectives identified by the case study sites.

In some cases, the lead One-Stop agencies had to gain the support and cooperation of partners that were not convinced of the utility of an integrated approach. These agencies had to take concrete actions to encourage potential partners to "buy in" to the One-Stop vision during the first year of One-Stop implementation. This issue surfaced most often in case study sites that lacked a history of strong collaboration between the agencies responsible for JTPA and ES/UI services as well as in sites that had relatively weak previous coordination linkages between human services agencies and the employment and training system. Institutional histories at variance with the

### Exhibit 7-1
### Examples of Marketing Roles Played by State One-Stop Partners

| | |
|---|---|
| Indiana | A multi-agency marketing work team was established with representation from the state One-Stop team and the state external affairs unit. A consulting firm was hired to develop attractive brochures for use at the state level and by early One-Stop implementation sites. |
| Iowa | One of the major goals for the state was to assist the local sites to market their One-Stop services. To further this goal, the state developed an "events manual" to guide local sites in planning center opening receptions and open houses. |
| Massachusetts | The state has attempted to manage the diverse efforts of the local regional employment boards and their designated career center operators. The state has encouraged local efforts by career center operators to assess customer needs, develop marketing materials, and network with other workforce development agencies. Regional employment boards are expected to coordinate efforts by competing local centers to attract new business from job seekers and employers. |
| Wisconsin | The state has developed guidelines for use of the state logo at certified One-Stop sites, established a monthly publication to keep local sites informed of state activities, and distributed a template and software that can be used by local sites to produce a local One-Stop newsletter. |

One-Stop vision of system integration necessitated the use of extensive promotional efforts by lead agencies to "sell" the One-Stop vision to all partners. The key to resolving agency turf issues and overcoming bureaucratic inertia was often to focus on how redesigned services would benefit customers. Ongoing communication and feedback among partners were key to accomplishing the goals of internal promotion of the One-Stop vision.

In other cases, lead agencies had to build consensus about specific aspects of One-Stop design. Even where partners were in general agreement with the One-Stop vision of customer-driven services, some were not in favor of particular aspects of the One-Stop approach, such as how to divide service delivery responsibilities among agency partners. Some lead agencies continued to discuss and modify the proposed One-Stop approach with potential partners until consensus was reached on the One-Stop philosophy and approach. After the top policy makers for all participating agencies had agreed to conform to the new design, the vision was promoted to staff at all levels of the participating organizations. Case study sites also used internal promotional efforts to help partners and staff deal with the "culture change" of transitioning to the new One-Stop way of doing business.

As described in Exhibit 7-2, case study sites used a variety of different activities to encourage maximum "buy in" from all potential partners. While some case study sites used ongoing verbal and written communication vehicles such as newsletters, fact sheets, and presentations at meetings and conferences to keep all partners informed about the progress in implementing the One-Stop system, others teamed up with One-Stop capacity-building and communications work groups to plan more structured promotional events such as statewide conferences and retreats.

### GOAL 3. MARKETING THE OVERALL ONE-STOP SYSTEM TO EXTERNAL CUSTOMERS

Informing external customers about the emerging One-Stop approach and how it differed from the previous system was another important marketing goal identified by the case study sites. As part of their early marketing efforts, case study sites tried to inform the public about the new One-Stop system without raising customer expectations that could not be satisfied. A form of "light marketing" (as one state referred to it) was used while emerging One-Stop systems were still in a fluid state of development, to avoid triggering workloads that the local systems could not handle.

## Exhibit 7-2
## Examples of Internal Marketing Approaches

| | |
|---|---|
| Iowa | State staff prepared a newsletter targeted to state and local staff of the lead agency and local partner agencies.<br>State leadership spoke out on behalf of the One-Stop initiative. |
| Minnesota | The state published a newsletter called "Connecting."<br>Top officials from the lead agency conducted a two-month-long tour of the state—in which they made 42 presentations in 27 communities—to communicate the state's One-Stop vision to local partners and answer questions about local partners' concerns.<br>State agency leadership and an inter-agency "issues team" met quarterly with local-level partners to discuss issues regarding local integration.<br>The state involved staff from local centers in policy planning and development. |
| Ohio | State One-Stop management team publishes a newsletter called "One-Stop Link" and is in the process of developing a One-Stop video. The state marketing work team has published a strategic plan and a consultant has been hired to help implement the plan.<br>The State sponsored bi-annual conferences—"Partners Helping Partners"—to disseminate best practices among first-year pilot sites. |
| Texas | The state kicked off the One-Stop initiative with a conference to build a cohesive vision. The conference included a simulated career center. |
| Wisconsin | Prior to consolidating the state welfare and workforce development agencies, the state had a consultant conduct "Vision Quest" brainstorming sessions. |

To effectively communicate to the external world the overall design for their transformed employment and training systems, most of the case study sites developed a step-by-step marketing strategy. Exhibit 7-3 provides selected case study examples of the different types of activities used to market the overall One-Stop system. The first step was usually to develop a One-Stop identity and image to differentiate it from the previous system of separate categorical programs. To further this objective, states developed One-Stop names, logos, and sometimes catchy phrases to describe their newly-integrated systems. For example, Connecticut's One-Stop system is called "Connecticut Works;" Maryland calls its One-Stop system "CareerNet;" Iowa's Workforce Development Centers are referred to as sites where "customers can get their needs met; and Wisconsin's Workforce Development Centers are referred to as places "where people and jobs connect." Integrated marketing campaigns were also devised to unify One-Stop partners at the local level. For example, Baltimore integrates its various workforce development marketing efforts and initiatives using the theme "Employ Baltimore."

The second step used by the case study sites—keeping in mind that most were intentionally in a "light" marketing mode—was to inform customers about the reasons for and advantages of the new integrated service approach using such tools as open houses, community forums, newspaper stories, and the creation of electronic Web pages discussing the new customer orientation of the One-Stop system. Marketing promotions to the general public were sometimes undertaken at the state level and sometimes were initiated by local sites, with or without state assistance.

A third step in marketing overall One-Stop services often consisted of the development of more elaborate marketing tools for use at the local level. To guide local marketing efforts, states often developed marketing "templates" that included guidelines, tool kits, and manuals that gave local marketing staff specific suggestions about how to stage center opening celebrations or hold a community open house. At open houses, prospective customers were provided an orientation to the specific services and information available through the One-Stop system.

### GOAL 4. MARKETING SPECIFIC ONE-STOP SERVICES AND PRODUCTS

After the general public was alerted to the overall goals of the new One-Stop initiative, the next marketing task was to develop informational materials to provide

### Exhibit 7-3
### Examples of Marketing the Overall One-Stop System to External Customers

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | The local governing board for Lucas and Wood counties sponsored a community forum to orient employers and the general public to One-Stop plans. For concepts that were still in the developmental stages, ideas were solicited from potential customers.<br>Local centers in the Lucas/Wood County system held "Employers After Hours" open houses to inform local employers about the new system.<br>A local brochure and video were produced to promote the system to both employers and job seekers.<br>Employer luncheons were held, featuring talks given by successful job seekers and satisfied employer customers. |
| Massachusetts | The state's Web site provides an overview of the philosophy and goals of the new competitive, customer-driven career center system. |
| Minnesota | In Anoka County, monthly calendars are distributed to individual career center customers announcing the planned calendar of events of interest to job seekers.<br>The One-Stop center in Anoka also increased employer awareness through local "on-air job fairs." |
| Ohio, Indiana | Brochures developed at the state level provide general information about the emerging state One-Stop system and the location of One-Stop centers currently in operation. |
| Texas | Staff at the Lake Jackson Career Center in Brazoria County use a wide variety of informal methods, such as public presentations at employer and community groups, displays at the county fair, and job fairs at local shopping malls, to inform the general public about their new workforce development system and publicize center services.<br>Word of mouth has also been an effective marketing tool for the Lake Jackson Career Center, as customers encourage their friends and relatives to try out the new One-Stop system. |

potential customers with information about the specific One-Stop services and products that were available. During their first year of One-Stop implementation, most case study sites introduced a variety of new services, including automated sources of information about jobs, careers, and training opportunities; and workshops on a variety of job-related topics.

As summarized in Exhibit 7-4, the case study sites used several different approaches to market specific One-Stop services and products to potential One-Stop customers. An approach used in most sites was to disseminate information about the specific services available in the One-Stop center through traditional means: conducting comprehensive face-to-face customer orientations for all new center customers, distributing descriptive leaflets and brochures, advertising in newspapers and on radio and television, and conducting information sessions for the staff of affiliated human service organizations so that they could make informed customer referrals. Some centers using this approach depended on the co-location of programs with a high volume of on-site customer flow—such as Unemployment Insurance and Employment Services—to bring potential One-Stop customers into the center so they could be exposed to the full range of services available at the center.

A second marketing approach, also widespread among the case study sites, was to establish electronic linkages to make job-seeker and employer customers aware of One-Stop services and to offer them a variety of technology-based services from their own homes or businesses or from a variety of community locations. The community locations included kiosks or terminals placed in schools, airports, libraries, shopping malls, community colleges, and service sites operated by One-Stop partner agencies. While qualifying as services in their own right, the Web pages and electronic bulletin boards also served as effective marketing tools to make a wide range of potential One-Stop customers aware of available services. Services that were particularly well-suited to marketing through remote access via the Internet or computer bulletin boards included listings of resumes and job openings, and access to information about careers, training opportunities, and local labor market conditions.

## GOAL 5. REACHING OUT TO AN EXPANDED CUSTOMER BASE

Traditionally, public workforce development and labor exchange systems have been perceived as serving primarily entry-level and hourly workers and their employers. All case study sites indicated an interest in reaching out to broader groups

## Exhibit 7-4
## Examples of Marketing Specific Customer Services and Products

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | The state has negotiated with the state library system for the establishment of "mini-career information centers" in libraries, linked to the *Connecticut Works* home page and electronic network.<br>Plans are underway to install Connecticut Works job kiosks at Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) offices throughout the state. |
| Indiana | The state plans to use the Department of Workforce Development's Web site to distribute information about One-Stop services and workforce development programs. Plans are also underway to allow customers with an Internet connection to access many of the same services on-line that are provided at One-Stop centers |
| Maryland | In the Baltimore Career Center Network, universal access requires outreach and the effective marketing of center services to the residents in Baltimore's high poverty and minority neighborhoods. As part of the Empowerment Zone initiative, CareerNet equipment and software will be installed in six satellite village centers that will be staffed by community-based organizations.<br>To educate customers about the services available at the Eastside Baltimore Career Center, a series of one-page "customer services sheets" has been prepared for each of the services offered. Each sheet includes a description of the service, as well as scheduling and enrollment information. |
| Massachusetts | The state's Web site on the Internet provides customer access to the state job bank as well as linkages to services offered by local career centers. |
| Texas | To fulfill the local outreach and marketing needs of the career centers in Tarrant County, local partners have prepared an orientation packet that describes individual, group, and self-services offered at career centers. Individual flyers from the orientation packet are also distributed to partner agencies. |

of job seekers and employers, including both large and small employers and workers with a broad range of formal education and skills. This interest in expanding services to new groups of customers is a response to rapidly changing skills requirements for many jobs, increases in job mobility, and increases in the rate of dislocation among workers at all levels; these changes have in turn been driven by changing technologies, global competition, and reorganized work structures. In this new context, workers at all skill levels need access to information about evolving occupational skills and ways to update their skills over time through "life-long learning," and employers need more efficient assistance in recruiting, screening, and training prospective and incumbent workers.

One-Stop planners have targeted broad groups of employers and workers that can benefit from access to improved local labor market information and information about careers and education and training resources. Case study sites are convinced that their new workforce development approach—assisted by its enhanced electronic capabilities—will be capable of serving new groups of employers (including small-to medium-sized employers and employers seeking candidates for management and technical positions) and new groups of current and future job seekers (including senior citizens who wish to remain in the workforce, high school seniors exploring new careers, and employed workers seeking enhanced skills and new careers).

### Activities to Reach Out to an Expanded Employer Customer Base

Many local case study sites focused their first year system-building efforts on developing and marketing user-friendly services for individual job seekers. In these sites, enhancing employer services and developing new marketing activities directed to employers was often deferred until the second implementation year. However, all case study sites planned to offer employers an expanded range of tools and products as part of their redesigned One-Stop systems and use more aggressive marketing strategies to increase the use of One-Stop services by local employers.

As described in Exhibit 7-5, employer outreach mechanisms that were in the planning stages or had been tested by case study sites during the first implementation year included the following:

- *Conducting employer focus groups.* Centers have conducted a variety of orientation and feedback sessions to acquaint employers with the One-Stop center and its vision for transformed employer services and to obtain feedback on more efficient ways to serve the local employer

### Exhibit 7-5
### Examples of Activities Designed to Reach Out to an Expanded Employer Customer Base

| | |
|---|---|
| Maryland | The lead agency for the Baltimore Career Center Network has developed an aggressive employer marketing campaign with the theme "Employ Baltimore." Advertised employer incentives for participation in the Employ Baltimore campaign included free listings on a computerized job bank, free screening and referral of job seekers who "match" the employer's description, access to services provided by a single "account executive," access to a variety of tax credits (e.g., for hiring Empowerment Zone residents), and free on-site or off-site customized training for targeted job seekers. |
| Massachusetts | At the state level, market research on employer needs was based on surveys of 200 businesses to identify customer needs and attitudes about the public workforce development system. To attract employers, the state is preparing a 25-page brochure on career centers.<br>The Springfield Career Center markets economic development incentives and business consulting to employers as well as job listing and job referral services. |
| Minnesota | State marketing activities directed to employers include the use of video resumes, the dissemination of a monthly publication directed to employers, and an "on-air job fair" on a popular television station that describes available job candidates. Employer conferences are planned.<br>To attract employers, the state emphasizes the ability of the One-Stop system to avoid duplication of effort and save time through the use of a single integrated applicant pool.<br>Unemployment Insurance tax auditors also perform marketing functions. Because they come into contact with many employers in the course of insurance audits, the state has been encouraging UI auditors to educate employers about the range of workforce services available to them, including funding for training current and prospective employees, the availability of career centers for conducting interviews, and information sessions for new employers. |

**Exhibit 7-5** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | Activities planned as part of an intensified employer marketing campaign in Wood county include "Employer After Hours" sessions at the One-Stop center, a Town Hall meeting to be co-sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce, and employer lunches profiling employers and individual job seekers who have used the new system and who support it. |
| Texas | In the 13-county Houston–Galveston Gulf Coast area, regional employer services representatives make visits to outlying communities and assist center staff in designing customized recruitment and expanded services for local employers. |

community. Other activities consist of community forums to which employers are invited, and the conduct of open houses and "Employer After Hours" events to increase the opportunity for informal discussions between employers and One-Stop staff.

- *Conducting employer customer satisfaction surveys and needs assessments.* To target their marketing more efficiently, local sites have conducted surveys soliciting employer feedback on such issues as the frequency with which employers use the public system, their projected employment needs, and their suggestions for improving the public employment and training system.
- *Linking One-Stop marketing to employers with marketing efforts by economic development affiliates.* In keeping with the evolution toward an integrated workforce development system, a number of case study sites are collaborating with economic development partners at both the state and local levels to reach more employers and provide a wider range of services. Marketing efforts to employers cover the "traditional" services of listing job openings and screening job applicants, as well as a number of "enhanced" services, such as job analyses, skill needs assessments, and assistance in planning, financing, or providing retraining for employers' current workforces.

*Developing promotional materials targeted specifically to employers.* Case study sites have developed informational videos, prepared brochures listing specific employer services, and distributed marketing materials with center locations and telephone numbers prominently displayed. A number of promotional materials emphasized personalized employer services, such as the use of a designated "account executive" for each company, the availability of center space for employer interviews with job applicants, and individualized skills assessments and job referrals tailored to employers' specific hiring needs. Other marketing activities included job fairs designed to meet the needs of a number of employers.

### Activities to Reach Out to an Expanded Job-Seeker Customer Base

Case study sites are attempting to attract not only larger numbers of job-seeker customers, but also job-seekers with a wider range of educational preparation and work experience, including mid-management and technical workers, career changers, students, recent high school graduates, senior citizens, and displaced homemakers. This effort, case study sites are finding, also supports their efforts to recruit a broader employer customer base. Building a pool of salaried applicants with a high level of technical skill, for example, is useful in convincing employers to use career center services rather than services offered by private-sector head hunters or outplacement firms.

As described in Exhibit 7-6, approaches used to reach varied potential customers included the following:

- *Establishing linkages with secondary and post-secondary schools* to make students aware of career center resources.
- *Using a broad range of public media* to increase general public awareness of One-Stop career center systems and the services they offer.
- *Using data on customer satisfaction* to ensure that services are attractive to all customers.

Efforts to reach a broad range of job seeker customers have also been facilitated in a number of cases by the development of services attractive to higher-skilled workers (e.g., providing information about education and training resources for a wide range of professional and technical careers) and by the expansion of operating hours to make career centers more accessible to employed workers who are interested in enhanced skills training or career shifts.

### GOAL 6. LINKING ONE-STOP MARKETING EFFORTS TO PROMOTIONAL EFFORTS FOR RELATED WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

Consistent with their interest in reaching out to a broader customer audience, case study sites identified a need to strengthen their marketing linkages with other workforce development programs that are pursuing overlapping and related objectives. Examples of such marketing linkages are shown in Exhibit 7-7. Case study sites were particularly interested in forging strong marketing linkages with welfare-to-work and school-to-work initiatives that were also in the formative stages of development. To date, marketing linkages with these initiatives have been difficult to achieve. However, a number of case study sites—particularly in those states that have received federal School-to-Work demonstration grants—expressed a desire to coordinate marketing efforts with the state, regional, and local committees and agencies that represent related initiatives.

In some sites, integrated employer-marketing campaigns are being developed to consolidate employer contacts and encourage employers to participate in a variety of different roles across these related programs. As described above, sites also found that developing a closer marketing relationship with economic development agencies and

## Exhibit 7-6
## Examples of Activities Designed to Reach Out to an Expanded Individual Customer Base

| | |
|---|---|
| Iowa | The state Marketing Team assists local centers in organizing "grand opening" celebrations.<br>The Des Moines Workforce Development Center has developed a "Workforce for Teens Career Awareness" project in which high school seniors participate in an 8-week course at the center one hour each day and become familiar with public workforce development resources. |
| Indiana | The state has developed attractive brochures to assist in marketing One-Stop services to the general public.<br>The Indianapolis Eastside Career Center captures customer satisfaction comments on its self-service labor exchange computer systems, and uses these customer satisfaction surveys, along with telephone and mail follow-ups, to identify needed system improvements. |
| Maryland | One of the goals of marketing One-Stop Career Centers to the job-seeking public is to expand the pool of clients to include individuals with more diverse employment backgrounds and skills. Job Service workers processing UI claims are viewed as having an important role to play in marketing career center services to UI applicants and beneficiaries. Job fairs also appear to be effective in reaching out to job seekers with diverse job histories. |
| Ohio | The Wood County Employment Resource Center uses its popular Job Club and linkages with a local adult vocational school to attract customers. Word-of-mouth is effective here because of the popularity of the training programs and the large number of referrals from the welfare-to-work program, which is a co-sponsor of the center. |
| Texas | Although the Arlington Career Center in Tarrant County has not paid for general advertising, the programs offered at the Center have received press coverage in local papers, and specific events sponsored by Center partners, such as quarterly job fairs, are well publicized. |

### Exhibit 7-7
### Examples of Efforts to Link One-Stop Marketing Efforts with Promotional Efforts By Related Workforce Development Initiatives

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Throughout the state, the Department of Economic and Community Development (DECD) is being recruited as an active partner in the design, marketing, and delivery of One-Stop business services in association with the Business Services Units operated by the Connecticut Department of Labor (CTDOL).<br>The State Department of Education is also involved in educational needs assessments, career decision-making workshops for youth, and plans for using One-Stop centers to provide job development services to youth involved in school-to-work programs. |
| Indiana | A memorandum from the deputy commissioners responsible for One-Stop and Education and Training encourages local school-to-work collaborative teams to identify potential linkages, including electronic connections between One-Stop career centers and schools, and to develop joint action plans for marketing efforts targeted to students, job seekers, and employers. |
| Wisconsin | Numerous other statewide initiatives—such as welfare reform and the school-to-work initiative—led other agencies and divisions to move forward with their own workforce development marketing plans, which would have resulted in parallel marketing efforts to employers and workers. Recognizing the importance of a coordinated marketing effort for the One-Stop system, an Interagency Guidance Team on Marketing was formed and a marketing consultant sought to develop a marketing plan for the workforce development system as a whole. |

with local employer organizations was an effective strategy for attracting a broader base of employers and convincing them that the transformed One-Stop system could serve their employment and workforce training needs.

### ANALYSIS OF MARKETING ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Although all case study sites identified successful marketing as essential to the success of their emerging One-Stop systems, an overriding concern during the first year of implementation for developing One-Stop career center organizational structures and services resulted in marketing issues often receiving attention than they deserved. Even though marketing was not prioritized, however, most case study sites succeeded in establishing a general foundation and approach for future marketing effort.

The case study sites faced several key challenges in realizing their marketing goals:

- *One-Stop agency partners generally lacked previous experience marketing their services to the general public.* Most employment and training delivery systems—accustomed to serving clients who were already familiar with their services or were referred by other agencies—had not previously felt the need to conduct outreach efforts to the general public. As a result, agency staff lacked well-developed marketing skills and experience.
- *One-Stop partners were often reluctant to conduct widespread marketing before One-Stop systems were "ready."* All states expressed concerns about marketing their One-Stop systems before they were ready to deliver on their promises. On the other hand, generating customer interest in One-Stop services was critical to the success of the new systems.
- *Both individual job seekers and employer customers often held negative perceptions of the quality of public workforce development services.* Customer surveys conducted by many case study sites showed that both customer groups were dissatisfied with the bureaucratic and fragmented nature of previous services. Thus, marketing efforts had to be shaped so as to convince potential customers that the new system was user-friendly and different from previous systems in its focus on providing services relevant to customer needs.
- *Some One-Stop partners feared that they would lose their individual agency identities if they participated in an integrated marketing campaign.* Thus, One-Stop marketing efforts had to be sensitive to these fears while coordinating the marketing efforts undertaken by

individual partners and promoting a unified One-Stop identity to outside customers.

- *State and local One-Stop planners and administrators had different marketing needs and timetables.* Early local pilot sites often looked to the state level for assistance with local marketing efforts before state staff had completed the process of developing a comprehensive or unified One-Stop marketing strategy.

Despite these challenges, case study sites were able to accomplish important marketing goals. These include the following:

- *The development of a planning and decision-making structure for ongoing marketing efforts.* Most case study sites assigned marketing tasks and activities to interagency committees at the state and local levels and established marketing priorities. A few sites decided to wait until the second year to begin planning how to promote their One-Stop systems.
- *The design of a logo, name, and unified identity for the transformed One-Stop system.* All case study sites emphasized the importance of changing the identity and public image of the emerging One-Stop employment and training delivery system and emphasizing to the general public that "we are changing the way we do business."
- *The design and implementation of new strategies to market One-Stop services to an expanded customer base.* Case study sites were quick to recognize the importance of reaching out to new job-seeker and employer customers, using technology-based outreach and self-service products. As described in the previous section, case study sites carried out marketing efforts designed to reach new customer groups, such as employed workers, students, and highly-skilled workers.
- *The identification of external marketing consultants and the development of improved marketing skills by in-house staff.* Case study sites are aware that reaching out to an expanded customer base—particularly to private-sector employers—requires sophisticated marketing strategies and materials beyond those generally available among One-Stop staff at the state and local level. To fill this gap, case study sites hired marketing consulting firms, recruited economic development agency representatives for participation on marketing committees, and increased the marketing skills of local staff through staff training and increased staff exposure to marketing principles and tools.

Given the impressive first-year accomplishments of case study sites in a number of other areas of One-Stop system transformation, the marketing accomplishments achieved by the One-Stop case study sites have provided a sound foundation for future marketing efforts. Most case study sites are now in a position to launch their One-Stop promotional plans when they determine that the time is right for a full-scale marketing effort.

However, a number of marketing challenges remain for states and local areas to address during subsequent phases of One-Stop implementation. Key among these challenges are the following:

- *The need to address continuing communication gaps between states and their local sites about their respective roles and timelines for marketing One-Stop systems and services.* States often made efforts to include local One-Stop staff on marketing committees and to communicate state marketing plans to local sites. Local One-Stop respondents nevertheless often complained that the state was not keeping them informed about marketing plans and activities. At times, local sites waited for the state to take the lead in marketing. However, states were not always prepared to support the early marketing efforts of One-Stop local implementation sites.
- *The need to develop more comprehensive marketing products and informational materials to inform job seekers about local One-Stop centers, networks, and services.* While case study sites have made some progress in developing promotional materials and products—such as orientation videos—most sites were still in the formative stages of developing marketing products representing the *completed* One-Stop system as opposed to the general concept or "vision." As more local sites are established during second and third implementation years, they will be eager to receive marketing supports from the state and examples of the marketing materials developed by early centers. There will be an increased demand for marketing templates or "tool kits" prepared by states for use in local sites. Sharing information about effective marketing strategies among sites will also become a priority.
- *The need to develop effective marketing tools to make employers aware of the expanded range of services available to them through One-Stop centers.* These expanded services include business consulting, access to business expansion assistance, and services to assist employers in training their existing workforce. There is also a need to convince employers that public labor exchange services are high-quality and a good value.
- *The need to develop assessment tools to measure the effectiveness of the new marketing plans and strategies.* Although needs assessments and customer surveys have been introduced to measure customer satisfaction with One-Stop services, local sites will also need information about the

relative success of different marketing approaches and activities. This assessment will be influential in refining new marketing strategies over time.

- *The need to develop additional marketing approaches that take full advantage of the new electronic communication tools and technology-based products offered to customers.* As case study sites continue to develop Web sites to deliver One-Stop services, they need to make better use of these technologies to reach out to prospective customers and market the transformed One-Stop systems.

# 8. MEASURING ONE-STOP PERFORMANCE AND PLANNING FOR SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS

## INTRODUCTION

One of the guiding principles established by DOL is that One-Stop systems be both performance-driven and outcomes-based. In this chapter, we discuss states' progress in developing performance measurement and accountability systems for One-Stop and how they are using performance measures for system improvement.

To develop systems in congruence with DOL's principle, states need to:

1. Define performance measures for the One-Stop system.
2. Implement a system for measuring One-Stop performance.
3. Use performance measures for program improvement.

Although all of the case study states had started down the road toward a performance-driven system, they varied substantially in how they planned to measure One-Stop performance and in the extent to which they had implemented performance measurement systems at the time of our site visit.

## GOAL 1. DEFINING PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR THE ONE-STOP SYSTEM

All states expressed a strong commitment to establishing a performance-driven One-Stop system. Indeed every state had at least started the process of defining performance measures for their One-Stop system by the time of our site visit.

Defining performance measures was typically a state effort, rather than a local one. Although local programs and staff often had input into the planning process, the state led the effort to develop performance measures. For example, Indiana established a work group consisting of state and local staff from JTPA service delivery areas and ES offices to help the state office shape One-Stop performance evaluation approaches. The state then developed a performance evaluation strategy that built upon the work group's ideas.

A few local areas, however, developed their own performance measurement system instead of waiting for the state. For example, while the state of Maryland had yet to move beyond stating general goals for its One-Stop system, the city of Baltimore had developed an extensive performance measurement system for its multi-site local

One-Stop network by the time of the site visit. This system included performance goals for the following areas: coordination and collaboration, uniformity of services among agencies and sites, the number of customers receiving multiple services, the number of jobs listed, and the number of customers served from the general public. Baltimore is also tracking additional outcomes for centers, including the number of placements, daily traffic flow, enrollments in the automated Job Bank, and the number of individuals receiving specific services. They are also measuring customer satisfaction.

In defining performance measures, states typically emphasized measures of customer satisfaction for both individual and employer customers, and were also concerned with employment outcomes for individuals. But states also defined measures for other aspects of performance. States typically developed or planned performance measures in several of the following categories:

- Individual and employer satisfaction. All states planned to measure customer satisfaction, usually for both employer and individual customers.
- Individual outcomes. Almost all states planned to measure employment for individuals, with about half of those planning to measure wages or earnings as well. About half of states also planned to measure skill attainment or educational achievement.
- Employer outcomes. Slightly over half of the states planned to measure employer outcomes, typically based on the filling of job orders.
- Equity and access. Slightly over half of the states planned to measure equity of access for specific demographic groups.
- Process measures. Most states were planning some type of process measures. Most were planning qualitative measures related to the implementation of One-Stop centers, including the breadth of services available, extent of customer choice, and the extent of collaboration and coordination. Others focused on the method of service (e.g., use of self-access or group services).
- Cost and efficiency measures. About half of the states planned to use cost or efficiency measures. These ranged from measures of staff workload (UI claims per staff position) to measures of return on investment.
- Market share/total utilization. Most states planned to measure either the market share of One-Stop centers or the total utilization of the centers for employer or individual customers.

Exhibit 8-1 summarizes the types of measures planned by each of the case study states.

In many cases, these plans were still under development at the time of our site visit and may have changed since this information was collected. The exhibit does, however, illustrate the general breadth of states' performance measurement plans and some of the diversity among states in the types of measures planned. Exhibit 8-2 presents some example measures in each of the categories.

### GOAL 2. IMPLEMENTING ONE-STOP PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Although all states had a commitment to developing a One-Stop performance measurement system, they varied substantially in the extent to which they had actually implemented performance measurement procedures by the time of the site visit. Although a few states were able to implement their performance measurement system nearly in full, most were in the first of several planned phases of implementation, while a few were still in the planning stage. Typically, states were able to implement fully measures that had been adapted from those used by partnering programs. In contrast, states were moving more slowly in implementing measures that broke new ground. Below we discuss some of the strategies used by states to implement One-Stop performance measurement.

Because most other states were planning some form of phased implementation—both of One-Stop systems and of performance measurement procedures—they needed to develop a strategy to ensure accountability during the implementation process. Three strategies were used by the case study states.

First, some states emphasized the use of process measures during a first phase, using on-site reviews to assess whether the desired features of the One-Stop system had been achieved. A number of these sites planned to assess participant outcomes during a second phase of One-Stop performance measurement. Wisconsin, for example, developed the *Job Center Standards*. The Job Center Standards are a set of process measures that describe the characteristics of a well-coordinated local system (functional standards) and identify a minimum menu of services that centers are expected to provide to individual and employer customers (service standards). For example, one functional standard is that assessment not be redundant across participating partners, while one service standard is that testing and assessment be available to all customers. These process measures are supplemented by existing program outcome measures.

## Exhibit 8-1
## Cetegories of Planned Performance Measures in Case Study States

| | CT | IN | IA | MD | MA | MN | OH | TX | WI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Individual Outcomes** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employment/retention | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Wages/earnings | | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Skill attainment/educational achievement | | | ✓ | ✓ | | | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Other | | | | | ✓ | | | | |
| **Employer Outcomes** | | | | | | | | | |
| Filling of job orders | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | ✓ | | |
| Other | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | | |
| **Customer Satisfaction** | | | | | | | | | |
| Individual satisfaction | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Employer satisfaction | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| **Equity and Access** | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | |
| **Process Measures** | | | | | | | | | |
| Breadth/choice of services | | | | | | ✓ | | | ✓ |
| Coordination/integration | | | | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |
| Timeliness of services/waiting time | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| Utilization of services | ✓ | | | | | | | | |
| Method of service | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | | |
| **Cost and Efficiency** | ✓ | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| **Market Share/Total Utilization** | | | | | | | | | |
| Employers | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | |
| Individuals | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | |

Note: The information in this table has been drawn from multiple sources and may include measures planned by states at different times. Further, because most states are still developing their performance measurement systems, this table should not be relied on to document the current plans for performance measurement.

## Exhibit 8-2
## Examples of Planned Performance Measures in Case Study States

| | |
|---|---|
| **Individual Outcomes** | |
| Employment | Percent of applicants placed during the program year (IN)<br>Number employed 90 days after completing services or entering employment (IA)<br>Employment in occupations that support a living wage (MN) |
| Wages/earnings | Wages and earnings 1 year after program (OH)<br>Percent with higher post-program than prior earnings (TX) |
| Skill attainment/educational achievement | 4 levels of educational attainment (IA)<br>Increased life-long learning (MD)<br>Number achieving one or more skill enhancements (OH) |
| Other | Positive outcome rate (MA) |
| **Employer Outcomes** | |
| Filling of job orders | Percent of job orders filled (IA) |
| Other | Repeat customer rate (MA) |
| **Customer Satisfaction** | |
| Individual satisfaction | Index of individual satisfaction (several states) |
| Employer satisfaction | Index of employer satisfaction (several states) |
| **Equity and Access** | Access/equity based on gender, age, race/ethnicity, and disabled status (TX) |
| **Process Measures** | |
| Breadth/choice of services | All services available in electronic or written form (MN)<br>Testing and assessment available to all customers (WI) |
| Coordination/integration | Assessment is not redundant across participating partners (WI) |
| Timeliness of services/waiting time | Average number of minutes for longest wait (CT) |
| Utilization of services | Usage of information resource areas in centers (IN) |
| Method of service | Percent of applicants receiving services in group setting (CT) |
| **Cost and Efficiency** | Decrease in UI tax rate (OH)<br>Return on investment (OH) |
| **Market Share/Total Utilization** | |
| Employers | Ratio of job openings listed to new hires (IN)<br>Number of employer customers (MA)<br>Penetration rate with employers with growing and sustaining employment (MN) |

| | |
|---|---|
| Individuals | Percentage of people employed (new hires) who receive services (MD)<br>Number of customers from general public (Baltimore) |

Simultaneously, the state is developing customer satisfaction surveys for both individual and employer customers and working on developing outcome measures.

On-site reviews were also used by the second group of states that used a combination of process and outcome measures during an initial implementation phase. An example is Ohio, where cross-program monitoring teams evaluated each local One-Stop system against self-determined goals and benchmarks. The reviews resulted in recommendations for local system improvements. During the initial period, local sites were also expected to meet existing performance standards and reporting requirements for individual categorical programs. They were also encouraged to use locally designed tools to measure customer satisfaction. The state simultaneously developed an integrated case management system designed to track performance outcomes. Full implementation of a One-Stop performance measurement system is scheduled to occur once the case management system is operational.

Minnesota is another example of a state that used a combination of process and outcome measures during an initial implementation phase. Workforce centers in Minnesota are expected to conduct customer satisfaction surveys in their first year of operation to establish baseline data from which to measure future improvements. They are also expected to show progress in providing access to electronic services and to document their ability to offer customers a wide range of choices of both services and providers. At the same time, the state established baselines for performance measures that were planned to go into effect during the second year. The state is also beginning to plan an integrated MIS by determining what data are mandated for collection across all participating programs and identifying data that are unnecessary for assessing One-Stop performance. The state plans to request waivers to eliminate unnecessary data collection.

Third, other states simply relied on existing program performance measures (e.g., JTPA, ES) to provide accountability while they developed their performance management system. These program performance measures remained in effect in all states, regardless of the implementation of One-Stop performance measurement.

Connecticut was one of the few states that was able to implement a nearly complete performance measurement system during the first year of One-Stop career center operations. The Connecticut system measures center performance on a quarterly basis. The quarterly performance reports not only display each center's measured performance, but also compare it to the normal performance range in the state, to benchmarks for best practice in the state, and to an ultimate performance goal. The system includes about 20 different performance measures, including individual and employer outcomes, employer and individual satisfaction, process measures, and an efficiency measure. Although the system is elaborate and incorporates a wide variety of measures, the system was originally designed for ES and UI offices and then applied to One-Stops as well. Because the existing ES and UI data systems could already support these measures, Connecticut was able to fully implement its system quickly. However, the performance measures focus narrowly on the ES and UI services offered within One-Stop centers; the greater scope of the One-Stop system is not recognized. Thus, the system lacks attention to some of the outcomes addressed by other states, such as measures of wages and earnings or of skill attainment for individual customers.

### GOAL 3. USING PERFORMANCE MEASURES FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Performance measurement is not an end in itself; instead performance measurement is intended to be a tool that can be used to foster program improvement. Although all states expressed their intention to use performance measurement in this way, states varied considerably in their implementation of program improvement systems. Typically, those states that were further along in implementing performance measurement were also further along in using performance measures for program improvement. All states, however, were planning one or more efforts to encourage the use of performance measures for program improvement. These efforts included the following:

- Requiring or encouraging local One-Stop systems to use performance measures to improve their programs. Most of the case study states encouraged centers to engage in continuous improvement.
- Providing training in continuous improvement or total quality management (TQM).
    - Minnesota is developing a program of "Workforce Excellence Training" designed to promote customer satisfaction and continuous improvement based on TQM criteria and to introduce best practices through replication of products and resources developed throughout the country. Training will be provided to state and center staff in a "train the champion" model.
- Implementing a formal, state-developed continuous improvement process.

  - Connecticut developed a complete continuous improvement process including quarterly performance reports that highlight performance problems for each center; training for center staff in continuous improvement, TQM, and other techniques for identifying program improvements keyed to the use of the quarterly report; and on-going technical assistance by state staff for local continuous improvement efforts.

- Planning to make managers accountable for performance.
  - Indiana planned to develop accountability standards for use in evaluating managers' performance. Managers were to be evaluated on program performance standards and on the overall operation of their offices.

- A system of incentives for good performance and sanctions for poor performance.
  - Many states indicated in their One-Stop implementation proposals to DOL that they would develop systems of incentives for good performance and sanctions for poor performance. Typically these plans would provide technical assistance to poorly performing centers and require them to implement corrective action plans. Financial rewards were also planned for high performing centers. At the time of our site visits, however, states typically had not yet implemented these systems.

Among the local areas we visited, several were using performance measures to help design program improvements. As mentioned earlier, Baltimore had developed an extensive set of performance measures. The Baltimore Eastside Career Center also collected customer satisfaction information and used some performance and satisfaction measures to evaluate performance of individual staff. This system is designed to motivate staff to provide excellent service to customers.

Several other local areas were using customer feedback to help design system improvements. For example, the Arlington (Texas) Career Center asks customers to complete a form with suggestions, comments, or complaints. Completed forms are posted in the resource room and customer feedback is regularly reported to staff. FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield, Massachusetts, established a cross-functional "No Excuses Team" charged with maintaining customer focus, designing mechanisms for customer feedback, and ensuring that such feedback informs the continuous improvement process.

Other local areas were collecting performance and customer feedback information but had not started to use these data for program improvement. For example, the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center was focusing on collecting data on the center's design and delivery of services, but staff had not yet developed an approach to analyzing and using these data. Similarly, the Minnesota Workforce Center in Anoka County collects customer feedback using comment forms and regular "customer advisory" focus groups, but did not have an effective system for analyzing and disseminating the information to front-line staff.

Still other local sites were holding off on both collecting and using performance information. For example, the Des Moines (Iowa) Workforce Development Center was waiting to obtain customer feedback and implement a continuous improvement process because their One-Stop system was as yet not fully developed. Similarly, staff in the Columbia, Maryland, Career Center believed that they could not yet obtain good measures of customer satisfaction because their interim hardware and software difficulties would negatively skew customer feedback.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS, CHALLENGES, AND NEXT STEPS

Although developing a performance measurement system for One-Stop was an important element of each state's One-Stop agenda, most states had not yet fully implemented such systems at the end of the first year of One-Stop operations. Nonetheless, most states had made significant progress in planning their performance measurement system and most states were able to establish some preliminary mechanisms to assure accountability for One-Stop systems.

Overall, accomplishments at the end of the first year of One-Stop operations include the following:

- All case study states had started a process designed to define performance measures for One-Stop centers. Although a few states had determined only the general areas in which they wanted performance measures (e.g., employment retention), others had developed detailed definitions.
- Some states had started redesigning their information systems to support new One-Stop performance measures.
- Some states were able to start collecting data for at least some of their planned performance measures; most others were planning to start in the near future.

- Nearly all states had put in place at least some preliminary mechanisms for providing accountability for their One-Stop systems.

State and local areas identified several impediments to rapid implementation of One-Stop performance measurement systems, including the following:

- The early stage of One-Stop implementation. There was a strong sentiment among many local areas that implementing performance measures while One-Stop centers were still in their infancy would stifle innovation. Some areas were also concerned that measuring performance before ongoing implementation problems were resolved would be unfair.
- The absence of an integrated MIS. Several states have included the development on an integrated MIS as an essential element of their strategy for measuring One-Stop performance (see Chapter 4). Consequently, full implementation of performance measurement was often delayed while states tackled the process of building a new MIS.
- Inconsistency between existing program performance measures and planned One-Stop measures. Local areas saw collecting and meeting both One-Stop and program performance measures as complex, confusing, and burdensome. For example, some areas are concerned that existing ES measures do not recognize the improvements in customer service inherent in their One-Stop designs.
- Measuring performance for self-access services. Several states were struggling with developing a way to measure performance for self-access services. Although none had developed way to measure outcomes, some were planning to measure usage of self-access services.
- Allocating responsibility and credit. Several states and local areas were concerned about how to allocate responsibility for successes and failures when a single person is served by multiple agencies

These challenges and impediments suggest some of the next steps that states will need to take to develop effective One-Stop performance measurement systems.

- Virtually all states are moving forward in defining performance measures at the same time that DOL is working to develop a "menu of measures" for One-Stop systems. To make best use of these simultaneous efforts, it will be important to promote information sharing, both among states and between DOL and the states.
- Most states will need to expand their vision of performance measurement to cover the full breadth of One-Stop systems. A critical issue for many states will be to develop effective ways of measuring

performance for self-access services, which are increasingly important elements of One-Stop systems.

- In light of the fact that developing an integrated MIS or case management system is seen as a precursor to performance measurement by many states, and because performance measurement for One-Stop systems is evolving, it is important that MIS systems be flexible enough to allow the introduction of new performance measures. Also, because many states have embarked on similar MIS development tasks, it is desirable to encourage information sharing and collaboration.
- States need to develop a vision of the purpose of performance measurement and how performance measures will be used. Alternatives under consideration range from the development of incentive and corrective action systems with a strong state role to merely encouraging local systems to use performance measures to improve their programs.
- There is a strong need for capacity building in using performance information for program improvement. Many local One-Stops are collecting customer feedback and other performance information, but have been unable to analyze or use the data effectively. Until local areas have the capability to use performance information to improve their programs, they may see performance measurement as an empty exercise with no value to them.

# SECTION D
# DESIGNING AND DELIVERING ONE-STOP SERVICES

# 9. ONE-STOP SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUAL CUSTOMERS

## INTRODUCTION

Transforming services for individual customers was the most immediate and pressing objective of the One-Stop initiative. Within One-Stop centers, services are intended to address the specific needs of each individual customer. The One-Stop vision calls for the creation of a seamless service system that can meet the needs of a broad range of individual customers of varied backgrounds, ages, skill levels, and financial situations. These customers include recently dislocated workers, veterans, long-term unemployed, welfare recipients, new labor market entrants, students, and already-employed workers, as well as persons with serious barriers to finding employment due to disabilities or lack of education, language skills, or adequate child care.

Three key principles of One-Stop systems relate to this vision:

- *Universal access* to services so that all customers—regardless of their eligibility for specific programs—can receive a core set of effective services.
- *Greater customer choice* so that customers can choose the content, intensity, and mode of delivery of services they need from a comprehensive service menu, and can choose among individual service programs and providers based on good information about the outcomes achieved by previous program participants.
- *Integrated services* so that customers encounter a seamless delivery system with an integrated point of access rather than a patchwork system made up of multiple programs offering overlapping services.

This chapter describes the different ways that states and local sites built on the expertise and experience of various partners within One-Stop systems to reengineer services for an increasingly broad range of individual customers.

## GOALS FOR TRANSFORMING SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUAL CUSTOMERS

The vision of improving services to customers has led to a number of common operational goals related to integrating services:

1. Simplifying customer access to workforce development services.

2. Providing a wide range of services to meet the needs of diverse customers.
3. Making effective self-access services available to all customers.
4. Providing guided services to customers needing assistance in developing career plans and finding appropriate employment.
5. Providing more intensive training and supportive services, when needed.
6. Providing targeted populations with specialized services.
7. Making One-Stop services convenient to access.

Each of these goals is discussed below.

### GOAL 1. SIMPLIFYING ACCESS TO SERVICES

All of the local sites in our sample identified integration of services to individuals as a key strategy to simplify customer access to workforce development services. Sites differed, however, in their approaches to integrating services, as described in Chapter 2. Sites used three basic strategies. First, some sites simplified customer access by using a "no-wrong-door" approach. Customers applying for service at any site within the local system were referred to the program best suited to their needs. Second, other sites integrated only "front-line" functions—such as reception and intake. The integrated intake staff then assisted customers in contacting relevant providers of program-specific services. Third, some centers consolidated a number of services available to individual customers, often by forming cross-agency functional teams that provide specific types of services (e.g., assessment, job development) to customers qualifying for a variety of categorical programs.

Regardless of the extent of integration of subsequent services, all centers had, at a minimum, integrated reception services that served as a single point of access to services for first-time center users. Most centers also integrated initial eligibility determination and orientation to the services available at the center. These efforts to integrate access to services are described below.

#### Integrated Reception

All centers had a single reception desk at the entrance to the One-Stop center so that the receptionist could help customers access the center's services. In Connecticut, for example, all larger One-Stops have a "greeter"—a staff member who has an understanding of the range of services offered at the center and can explain these services to customers. The greeter meets customers when they come in the main entrance, answers initial questions, gives a brief description of services available at the center, and directs customers to appropriate areas of the center. Depending on their needs, customers may be referred to an Employment Service, UI, JTPA, or VETS representative for initial intake. Customers may also be directed to the integrated "career services" center, where they can obtain further information about center and community resources as well as assistance using computers, telephones, printers, and copiers that are available for job seekers.

### Integrated Preliminary Eligibility Determination

Many sites integrated their preliminary eligibility determination procedures. Often the intake staff made a preliminary determination of the programs for which a customer was eligible and then referred customers interested in those services to staff for a more comprehensive determination of eligibility.

Two states, Maryland and Indiana, had established integrated procedures to determine eligibility for all One-Stop partners' programs. In Maryland, all centers had access to a client-driven automated system that assessed preliminary eligibility for all DOL programs, adult education, and Pell Grants. In Indiana, customers who were registering for ES or UI entered personal data into a computer that determines eligibility for many programs.

### Integrated Orientation to Services

The substantial majority of sites in our sample offered new users an integrated orientation to center services.[1] Several states required that centers provide integrated orientations, although their policies varied in what was required to be presented in orientation sessions.

In some centers, orientations were provided individually. For example, at the Wood County Center (Bowling Green, Ohio), a trained receptionist greets incoming customers on an individual basis and explains the services available. Customers applying for public assistance are also required to attend a group orientation, scheduled weekly.

---

[1] Comprehensive center orientations were available for all customers in New London and Willimantic, Connecticut; at the Eastside Indianapolis Center; in Springfield, Massachusetts; Baltimore, Maryland; Anoka County, Minnesota; and Arlington and Lake Jackson, Texas. Orientations were held for JOBS customers only in Des Moines, Iowa, and for Job Service customers in Columbia, Maryland.

Most centers in the sample offered comprehensive group orientations to all customers. Orientations typically include a presentation about the various services offered at the center and a walking "tour" of the center. For example, at Baltimore's Eastside Career Center, all customers signed up for one of nine weekly orientation sessions. Attendance at these session averaged 15 to 20 people. During the orientation session, customers:

- Viewed a video that provided an overview of the center and its services and gave examples of how center services have addressed the varying needs of different job-seeker and employer customers.
- Listened to a brief presentation and question-and-answer session by center staff that highlighted key services that may be available to center customers.
- Went on a guided tour of the center to see the various service areas and get an idea of how the space is laid out for customer use.
- Reviewed "customer service" sheets that described each service offered at the center and when it was available.
- Received an initial orientation to "CareerNet," an automated job bank and career information system.
- Signed on to the computer system and entered information that helped determine eligibility for different programs.

## GOAL 2. PROVIDING A WIDE RANGE OF SERVICES TO MEET THE DIVERSE NEEDS OF CUSTOMERS

### The Pyramid of Services

Two of the key themes of the One-Stop initiative have led One-Stop centers to provide a wide range of service options. First, the goal of providing universal access to services meant that One-Stop centers were serving a much more diverse group of customers than was previously served in each of the individual categorical programs. Second, the goal of providing customers with meaningful choices about how to access services also meant that One-Stop centers needed to provide a wide range of service options.

To offer customers a wide range of services and greater choice among them, most centers adopted some variant of a "pyramid" model of services, consisting of three tiers.

"First tier" options consisted of *self-access services*. All centers made these self-access services available to all customers, regardless of program eligibility. Typically, these self-access services allowed customers to obtain labor market information and information on jobs, careers, and education and training providers in the area. Customers could also use self-assessment and career planning products, learn about job search strategies, and access automated job postings. More detail about these services is provided below under Goal 3, Making Effective Self-Access Services Available to All Customers.

"Second tier" services were *guided or group services*. These services included more intensive assessment and career counseling, job matching, and group activities such as job clubs and workshops. Sites varied widely in the extent to which they made these guided or group services available to the general public, but most sites made at least some available to all customers. Second tier services are described in detail under Goal 4, Providing Guided Services to Customers Needing Assistance Choosing Careers and Finding Employment.

"Third tier" services were the most intensive and included *educational and occupational skills training and supportive services*. In all centers, the direct provision or funding of these more intensive services was limited to customers eligible for specific programs, such as JTPA. Third tier services are described in detail under Goal 5, Providing More Intensive Training and Supportive Services.

### Helping Customers Access Needed Services

Although a "pyramid" describes the structure of services, it does not describe how individual customers access the services they need. Not all customers started with self-access services and then moved up to more intensive services if the self-access services were not sufficient to meet their needs. Instead, customers could enter each service level from a variety of points.

Case managers and counselors acted as important "bridges" to services for customers eligible for categorical programs. As described above, most sites conducted a preliminary eligibility determination of customers new to the center. In these sites, customers who appeared to be eligible for specific programs were usually referred to staff who could help them determine whether or not they wanted to participate in that specific program. If so, staff would then assist eligible customers in accessing appropriate services, both from the specific program and from other programs in the center.

For example, JTPA-eligible customers who chose to enroll in that program would meet with a counselor to receive objective assessment and develop a comprehensive service plan, as required by the JTPA legislation. Similarly, customers eligible for JOBS, VETS, Vocational Rehabilitation, and other categorical programs and services were generally introduced to One-Stop services through one-on-one meetings with a case manager or counselor soon after intake or group orientation.

For customers not eligible for specific programs, however, the procedures varied across sites. At one extreme, the center in Springfield, Massachusetts, made available one-on-one meetings with case managers to develop action plans for all customers, regardless of eligibility.

Most other sites relied on other mechanisms to help customers access more intensive services. As described above, all sites provided orientations to give customers an overview of center services. Further, in sites that made group workshops available to the general public, these workshops were another means by which customers learned about the range of services available within centers. Staffed resources rooms provided another mechanism to help all customers access additional services. Staff in these areas had regular contact with individual customers, many of whom came to use services frequently during their job search. For customers interested in services beyond the first tier of services, these staff often provided additional help locating information on local employment, education, and training opportunities, and referring interested customers to individual career counseling sessions or group workshops (in sites where these services were available to all customers).

### GOAL 3. MAKING EFFECTIVE SELF-ACCESS SERVICES AVAILABLE TO ALL CUSTOMERS

The most significant change resulting from implementation of the One-Stop system has been the development of more extensive self-access services. One-Stop staff at all levels expressed three key themes that guided their development of these new products: (1) the need to improve the quality and relevance of labor market information; and (2) the need to make this information easily accessible; and (3) the need to present this information so that it is meaningful in helping customers make good decisions.

To address these needs, most sites have established career resource centers or career libraries, and designed products specifically for use in these self-service areas. These products provided self-access information services and, in some cases, self-access training services. Exhibit 9-1 presents examples of the self-access information and training services available in the One-Stop centers we visited. Customers who participated in focus groups at the various sites indicated that these services were among the most valuable in the One-Stop centers.

In addition to making self-access services available to customers who visit One-Stop career centers in person, advances in communications and information technology have made it possible for One-Stop centers to provide many of the same automated information resources to One-Stop customers from computer work stations or public-use kiosks located in a wide variety of community sites (ranging from community colleges to libraries to department of motor vehicles offices) as well as through remote access to individual computer users equipped with a modem via Internet Web sites or electronic bulletin boards maintained by the state, One-Stop center, or an affiliated agency.

### Self-Access Information Services

Most states have mandated that certain types of information—such as job listings, labor market information, and information about education and training opportunities—be made available to individual customers on a self-service basis in all local One-Stop centers.

In addition, some states invested heavily in the development of self-access products in order to make them available in all centers statewide. For example, Maryland developed a comprehensive system for career information and exploration, which is required to be available in all One-Stop centers throughout the state. Similarly, Texas has developed a multi-media career information system that, together with the state's career labor market education database, is required in all One-Stop sites. Respondents in these states indicated that such products have increased the consistency of services across centers and prevented duplication of effort.

Other states identified required categories of information that must be available to job-seeker customers in each One-Stop center, but did not mandate specific products.

**Exhibit 9-1**
**Examples of Self-Access Services**

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Customers can access a variety of information either through the Connecticut Works web site or through the Public Access Labor Information System (PALIS) bulletin board. Among the automated self-services are information and tips on searching for work, access to the state and national Job Banks, information on unemployment compensation and the appeals process, labor market information tailored for job seekers, and America's Talent Bank, a nation-wide pool of resumes.<br>Full-time Resource Library staff are charged with promoting career development for a universal population. Libraries contain information on labor market information, companies, materials on the job search, current job openings in electronic listings as well as from newspapers and other printed formats. Resource Librarians also provide information and referrals to a variety of other community resources including scholarships and training opportunities. |
| Iowa | Iowa One-Stop Centers are envisioned by the state as local clearinghouses for information on all local employment, training, education, and supportive services. Customers can access the state's Data Center remotely via a personal computer and modem or through the workforce development center computers. The Data Center provides an electronic bulletin board that lists job openings, labor market information, and recent employment news. Job listings available from in-house ALEX terminals and the DES Data Center use suppressed job orders, and customers must contact an ES Job Placement Specialist for information about the identity of the employer for a specific job listing.<br>At the time of the site visit, the state had introduced its Web site, and had made available CD-ROM based job search and resume development packages. The state was also developing state-wide and regional publications to help individuals to identify employment trends and expected growth areas. |

**Exhibit 9-1** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Indiana | At the Indianapolis Eastside Center, the core technology-based tools for use by individual customers include personal computers connected to the ALEX database offering Center customers access to jobs listed by local and statewide employers; Internet access to America's Job Bank and America's Talent Bank; the Job Service Matching System (JSMS) allowing clients to begin the skills match and job-search processes by entering their own skill-related information which is then matched with employer job orders; CHOICES, a career information delivery system provides information on career-related information and post-secondary educational institutions; and PC-based resume-writing software.<br>Customers looking for information about schools can find a variety of printed information—supplementing the computer-based CHOICES program—on schools, careers, financial aid, and other education-related subjects in the information resource library. They can also use the computer-based National Career Aptitude System (NCAS) which assesses their ability to learn and perform tasks associated with hundreds of occupations. A Microcomputer Occupational Information System (Micro-OIS) also provides occupational supply and demand information based on state and local labor market information. |
| Maryland | Resource Laboratories provide access to on-line job listings, career interest inventories, and education and training providers. At the resource laboratory at the Baltimore Eastside Center, staff are testing ways to supplement the state's automated on-line job listing service with additional computer-assisted instructional software.<br>Services available on personal computers in the laboratory include a computer-assisted resume writing program; a self-paced basic skills and GED instruction (Plato); self-paced job search instruction; career exploration and identification of transferable skills (Oasys); a typing tutorial (Mavis); and a word-processing tutorial (Word Perfect). Staff also intended to add Windows and Lotus tutorials to the instructional programs available in the local resource laboratory. |

**Exhibit 9-1** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Massachusetts | The Springfield Center provides on-line employment service registration, local job listings and job matching, access to America's Job Bank and other on-line labor exchange databases on-site and through remote access on the Internet; a talent bank; self-service and assisted access to labor market information in the resource room and through remote access to the state's Web site; information on careers, job, education and training providers; self-service career planning activities including CD-based programs for career exploration or assessment, career planning videos; and software to practice and self-certify skills in typing and 10-key data entry; and resume preparation assistance (both computer-based and staff-assisted). |
| Minnesota | Resource Centers within all planned and operational One-Stop centers in the state contain a standardized set of information tools accessible by individuals in a variety of media, including hard copy documents, periodicals, and videos. Centers have information about career areas, a computer-based encyclopedia on education and training programs available throughout the nation, job listings, a preference testing module that helps job seekers determine their best occupational path.<br>The recent creation by the state of six regional labor market analyst positions was seen by center respondents as a particularly positive development. Analysts have developed a standardized collection of 100 labor market information publications and have helped to inventory and stock resource rooms with information on such topics as the future outlook for employment opportunities in a variety of career categories, and employer profiles on state and national businesses. |
| Ohio | In Wood County, information on jobs, careers, employment and training programs for persons eligible for persons receiving public assistance are provided through the on-site DHS partner. A local vocational school provides information services to individuals who do not fall into a targeted population group. Access to job listings and job matching is also available to all customers through the kiosk for self registration, job search, and self-referral. Self-service access information is also available in their resource room and through kiosks in the community. A bulletin board in the reception room posts current available jobs. |

**Exhibit 9-1** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Texas | One-Stop Centers are envisioned by the state as central points of access to information and services that address the needs of all job seekers and students. The state has developed a variety of enhanced labor market information and other technology-based products including a case management tool called RESCUE originally intended to help dislocated workers determine the type of training they needed to re-enter into the labor market. A comprehensive career information and exploration system called Texas CARES has also been developed for people with little work experience. Texas is also leading a national consortium to develop a consumer report system. |
| Wisconsin | All One-Stop customers have access to a set of core information services available free of charge. Information sources at all One-Stop centers include access to the state's job listing service; an automated listing of job openings; Career Visions, an automated career information delivery system; and resource libraries offering a broad range of print and multimedia materials providing labor market, career, and job information. |

For example, Massachusetts required that local sites provide access to job listings (including the state job bank available via the Internet), information on education and training providers, and local labor market information. The state emphasized self-access technologies as an efficient means to delivery these services. However, individual sites had the responsibility of choosing specific products to use. Respondents in these states emphasized that they wanted to foster local innovation in developing products and services that would meet the needs of local constituents.

Although states approached the development of self-access products differently, the types of information they required were quite similar. States generally required the following self-access services to be provided to individual customers in all One-Stop centers:

- Labor market information.
- Assessment and career-planning information.
- Information about education and training opportunities and related community resources.
- Automated job listings or job matching services.

Local One-Stop centers usually made several improvements in the type of information available to customers. First, many centers tried to develop labor market information that was more up-to-date than previously available. Second, many centers tried to fill in gaps in the previously available information, for example, by conducting wage surveys of local employers. Third, they tried to make information more relevant to the local area. For example, some systems allowed users to choose the geographic level (e.g., city, country, state) for which they obtained information. Fourth, most One-Stop centers tried to help users see the relationships between the different types of information available.

To help customers link the different types of information, many sites made integrated information systems available. These systems integrated the various types of information—such as labor market information, career planning tools, and information about local training providers—so individual customers can more easily use the comprehensive information to make decisions.

For example, Texas One-Stop centers developed a system that allows individual users to access information from a variety of sources. Individual customers can use this integrated system to learn about wages, hiring patterns, and employers in specific geographic areas; identify career goals; and identify providers of training in their chosen field. Similarly, in Wisconsin, individual customers are encouraged to explore the state's Career Information Delivery System, which contains integrated information about occupations in the area, colleges and universities providing training in those occupations, and specific programs of study.

### Labor Market Information

Self-access labor market information was available to customers in all of the sites we visited. The types of information included:

- Industrial and occupational growth patterns in the nation, state, or county.
- Unemployment rates and projected employment trends by region in the state or by industry.
- Prevailing wages in specific jobs or occupational fields.
- Employers in specific industries in the state or area.

Sites varied considerably, however, in their progress in making this information available to customers electronically, and the degree to which customers were able to access the information independently. For example, in Iowa the two sites that we visited were quite different. The Des Moines One-Stop center encouraged customers to dial-in to access labor market information about Des Moines and the surrounding area. In contrast, the Creston site had not yet made self-access technologies available to customers and instead provided customers written materials developed by the state. Staff in this site indicated that this written information was often out of date.

### Self-Access Assessment and Career-Planning Information

Self-access assessment and career planning products were also available to individual customers in all of the centers we visited. Although some centers provided only printed materials—such as guides to careers in specific fields—most centers offered a variety of automated and multi-media products as well. Examples of these products included CD-driven interest or skill inventories, informational videos on career choices, computer programs to develop career-specific resumes, and structured linkages to additional resources available on the Internet.

### Information about Education and Training Providers

Information about education and training providers and other community resources was available in most centers we visited, but the quality, scale, and delivery systems for this information varied widely.

Most states were in the process of developing systems that would combine information about training services—such as programs offered, schedules, and costs—with information about the training providers' performance—such as placement rates and student assessments. For example, Texas is leading a mullet-state consortium to develop a "consumer report card" system, which will provide standardized performance evaluations of education and training providers. Customers will be able to access this system directly and compare the performance of various institutions providing training in a given occupation. At the time of our site visits, however, these systems were not yet operational in most sites.

Some sites provided relatively little information about alternative training providers in the community. One rural site, for example, maintained written information about education and training providers, but this information was not easily accessible to customers. As a result, a local vocational school was the primary recipient of training referrals from the One-Stop center.

In contrast, other sites provided extensive information. In Minnesota, for example, customers could access quantitative and qualitative information about a wide array of educational institutions' training programs. Further, through an automated comprehensive referral network, customers could access information about other community and social services for which they might be eligible. Moreover, in some cases, electronic transfer of basic eligibility data could be provided upon customer request.

Similarly, in Connecticut, the state department of education is working with One-Stop centers to make automated information about education and training opportunities available to center customers through its toll-free hot-line. Center customers may also access the department's on-line listings of accredited programs.

### Information about Available Jobs

All of the states we visited had developed systems that gave customers access to automated job listings via computers located within One-Stop centers. These technologies were fully operational in all but two of the local sites that we visited.

In most cases, customers could access America's Job Bank, the state's job bank, and local job listings. In some sites, customers could also access additional job listing services on the Internet, using one of the popular search tools. For example, in the Springfield, Massachusetts center, resource staff had "bookmarked" and catalogued Web sites that provided access to alternative job listings—such as those compiled by professional associations—as well as on-line newsletters and professional journals.

Although the One-Stop centers we visited encouraged customers to search job descriptions unassisted, most centers required customers to seek staff assistance to learn more about the specific positions in which they were interested. In Des Moines, for example, all job listings were "suppressed," which required all customers to contact an Employment Service job placement specialist to learn who an employer was and how to apply for the position.

Some sites were attempting to provide more unsuppressed listings so that individual customers could follow-up on openings independently. For example, in the center in Springfield, Massachusetts, employers were given a choice of posting suppressed or unsuppressed job listings on the local electronic job bank. In Texas, One-Stop centers offered employers the choice of placing wholly suppressed, partially suppressed, or unsuppressed job orders with the One-Stop centers, although employers were encouraged to post unsuppressed job orders.

### Self-Access Training

Many sites also provide self-access training using computer-assisted training packages. Examples of self-access training included instruction in basic skills and in specific vocational skills, such as keyboarding or using specific software applications.

For example, in the Baltimore Eastside Career Center, customers needing to improve their basic skills could use a computer-assisted, self-paced, basic-skills training program. The center in Springfield, Massachusetts, offered a 15-hour course in computer basics free-of-charge to its customers. Customers learned a basic computer vocabulary and how to navigate in Windows. This course was very well received by customers.

### Other Self-Access Services

Electronic talent banks, where individuals customers can post their resumes, were in the planning stages in most states. However, the nationwide system, America's Talent Bank, was still under development at the time of our site visits. Two centers offered this service locally, although it was not yet a wholly self-access service. For example, Maryland offered a program that contained suppressed resumes through which employers could search for qualified applicants. However, the program was not a self-access service for individuals.

Connecticut, as one of three states piloting America's Talent Bank, has since begun to offer this service to individual customers, both at its One-Stop centers and remotely through the ALMIS Web site. The service permits customers to develop resumes on-line and register with the talent bank without assistance. Although staff reported that the automated, on-line resume-maker is popular among a wide range of individual customers, the resume search capacities have not yet been adequately tested because the system has not yet been marketed to many employers.

Several One-Stop centers also offered individual customers self-access to office machines, such as telephones, fax machines, word processing, and printing services. Having this equipment available enabled individual customers to respond immediately to job leads they encountered through the other center services. Staff at one center indicated that providing public access to this equipment was an inexpensive way to "level the playing field" by giving all customers the ability to develop and print quality resumes, cover letters, and thank-you notes.

### Career Information Centers

Most centers designated a specific area to house all self-access products and services, often referred to as a career information center or a career resources area. Clustering self-access services into a single area made it easier for staff to orient customers to the self-access services and to assist them in using the services.

#### Staffing Career Information Centers

Although self-access services are designed so that customers can access them independently, many centers found that customers required some assistance, especially in learning to use automated systems. Staff of most centers reported that although many individual customers were impressed with the quality and quantity of on-line information available to them, they were reluctant to use services without some initial assistance. Many One-Stop centers have found that assigning knowledgeable, well-trained individuals to staff the resource areas on a full-time basis was a critical step in making self-access services effective. The director of one center we visited referred to these staff, who function much like resource librarians, as "enablers"—they do not deliver services in the traditional sense, but they enable customers to use services in ways that benefit them.

For example, in Springfield, Massachusetts, three staff were assigned to the resource area. These staff were encouraged to develop new processes, procedures, and workshops around self-service technologies and to make suggestions for changes that would better support customers using self-service technologies. These staff made themselves available by walking throughout the area to help customers who may have been hesitant to ask for assistance.

The importance of having knowledgeable staff in the resource rooms was confirmed by customers who participated in our focus groups. For customers unfamiliar with technology, resource room staff were able to provide technical assistance. For customers familiar with technology but not with job search strategies, resource room staff were able to assist in conducting more efficient searches and identifying resources that customers may not have known were available. For customers who visited the center specifically to use the self-access technologies, knowledgeable resource staff could direct them to other services in the center in which they might be interested.

#### Orienting Customers to Self-Access Services

Although most centers introduced customers to self-access services during their orientation programs or in separate workshops on how to use services, several respondents reported that customers "did not know what questions to ask until they began using the services." To orient new customers to resource rooms, most One-Stop centers provided written materials that described the self-access services.

Other sites developed more elaborate systems to orient new users of self-access services. For example, the Baltimore Eastside One-Stop Center developed a non-technical users' guide to its self-access computer services. Several other sites recognized the need to provide such instruction and were in the process of developing tutorials, videos, or on-line resources manuals, although such materials were not available at the time of our visits.

### GOAL 4. PROVIDING GUIDED SERVICES TO CUSTOMERS NEEDING ASSISTANCE IN CHOOSING CAREERS AND FINDING EMPLOYMENT

All One-Stop centers provided a second tier of services to assist job-seekers who needed more help than they could get through self-access services. In second-tier guided services, staff helped customers identify career goals and develop job search skills. Staff also facilitated job clubs to support customers during their job search. As discussed in the financing chapter, One-Stop centers faced a substantial challenge in financing these guided services for customers who were not eligible for categorical programs. One-Stop centers varied substantially, therefore, in their ability to make these services available to the general public, as we describe below.

### Assessment and Career Counseling

In addition to the self-access assessment and career planning tools, most centers offered staff-assisted assessment and career counseling to at least some types of customers.

In a few cases, which are highlighted in Exhibit 9-2, the same intensive assessment and career counseling were available to all customers who needed these additional services, regardless of program eligibility. For example, in Indianapolis, more intensive assessment was offered to all customers who needed such assistance. In Connecticut, all customers with substantial employment barriers were referred to assessment programs offered through the state's department of education.

Other centers made some assessment and career planning services available to all customers, but reserved the most intensive services for those who were eligible for specific programs. For example, in Springfield, Massachusetts, all customers could receive a preliminary assessment of their needs from a career specialist, but in-depth testing and assessment was reserved for customers of eligibility-based programs. Similarly, in Waukesha, Wisconsin, the local technical college, a key One-Stop partner, offered three different levels of assessment to different customer groups: the general public, JTPA and JOBS clients, and at-risk youth.

The remaining centers provided in-depth assessment and career counseling services only to customers eligible for specific programs. Some of these sites integrated their categorically-funded assessment and career planning services. Others sites continued to provide separate assessment and counseling services for those eligible for different programs.

### Workshops on Career Planning, Life Skills, and Job Search

Another type of second-tier service was group workshops on topics that help customers explore career options, decide on career goals, or learn how to search for jobs.

## Exhibit 9-2
## Examples of More Intensive Assessment and Career Counseling

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Customers with substantial employment barriers are referred to educational needs assessment programs offered through the state's Department of Education. For JTPA-eligible customers, Center staff use the Connecticut Competency System (CCS) and a variety of interest and career exploration inventories to help develop an individualized training or education plan. |
| Iowa | In Creston, in addition to a self-access assessment program available in the Resource Room, customers eligible for categorical programs may receive a formal battery of tests.<br>In Des Moines, all participating One-Stop partner agencies can refer individual customers to the Assessment Center for specified tests (from a menu that includes interests, aptitudes, general basic skills, work-related basic skills, and personality traits). The Des Moines' Partner's Group is considering whether the Center might offer case management, assessment/testing, and staffed job search assistance to interested members of the general public or whether these services will be available only to participants eligible for categorical programs. |
| Indiana | To supplement the core technology-based products available to the general public at the Indianapolis Eastside Center, assessment services are available to all job-seeker customers.<br>In Lawrenceburg, all participating partner agencies may refer individual customers to assessment through a broad battery of tests, covering customer interests, aptitudes, general basic skills, work-related basic skills, and personality traits. |
| Massachusetts | All customers at the Springfield Center are encouraged to develop an individual customer action plan with the assistance of an assigned career specialist. The plan is informed by a basic assessment of individual needs and skills. Eligibility-based assessment services include in-depth testing and assessment. |
| Minnesota | Core services for all customers include individual career guidance and assessment. |
| Wisconsin | Services currently available to all customers include assessment and interpretation of basic educational skills, vocational interests, and occupational aptitudes, provided through the Center's Community Career Center. As the partner responsible for assessment services, the technical college offers three different levels of assessment to different customer groups including the general population, JTPA clients, JOBS clients, and at-risk youth. |

Most centers reserved these workshops for customers eligible for specific programs. Four centers, however, offered a well-developed menu of group services for all customers, regardless of their program eligibility.[2] In these centers, modular workshops were available on an open-enrollment basis at regularly scheduled times. Customers could choose which workshops they wanted to attend, and generally could attend workshops in any order they wished. Workshops offered at these centers provided opportunities for customers to clarify goals and explore career options, as well as to develop plans for conducting their job search. Examples of these workshops are presented in Exhibit 9-3.

For example, the center in Anoka County, Minnesota, offered a range of workshops. One was a "creative job search" workshop providing an overview of the emotional, attitudinal, and financial challenges involved in employment transitions. Another workshop helped job seekers learn to identify and speak about their skills and accomplishments. Other workshops addressed preparing resumes, cover letters, and follow-up letters; matching one's experiences and skills with those required by employers; and learning interviewing and job search techniques.

### Enhanced Job Search Support

In addition to self-service options, most sites also offered enhanced job matching services for job seekers. For all customers, this support included providing job referrals to specific listings where the employer's identity was not made public.

Centers in Texas, Connecticut, and Minnesota also provided to the general public a variety of enhanced job search services that were originally developed for dislocated workers. Staff in some of these centers assisted job seekers with resume preparation and developing a job search strategy. Clerical assistance in preparing resumes and taking messages from prospective employers was also available in some sites. These and other services are detailed in Exhibit 9-4.

Job clubs were also available in many sites. Those job clubs that targeted customers who shared similar professional interests or faced common challenges were particularly popular among One-Stop customers. For example, in Springfield, Massachusetts, customers particularly liked a job club called "Over the Hill," which

---

[2] These sites were Springfield, Massachusetts; Blaine, Minnesota; Lake Jackson, Texas; and Pewaukee, Wisconsin.

## Exhibit 9-3
## Examples of Group Workshops

| | |
|---|---|
| Minnesota | A variety of workshops are available at the Anoka Center at no cost to anybody wishing to attend. These workshops cover a range of career exploration and job search topics and are offered at regularly scheduled times, lasting from two hours to a full day. Workshops include a *creative job search* basic workshop involving an overview of the emotional, attitudinal, and financial transition processes involved in employment transitions; a module on applying skills to the job search, assisting job seekers in learning to identify and speak about their skills and accomplishments; two modules on *written credentials*, focusing on the variety of techniques used in writing resumes, cover letters, and follow-up letters; an *applications and references* workshop in which job seekers are taught how to match their experiences and skills with those required by employers on application forms, and how to identify the most suitable persons to list as references; two *interviewing* modules in which participants learn about key interview questions and legal rights, and practice interviewing techniques which are videotaped in 5-minute mock interview sessions; and modules on the *hidden job market* which treat alternative methods to finding jobs, including networking, responding to advertisements, and contacting agencies and companies. In one module, job seekers learn how to use the telephone in the job search by preparing a script and contacting employers during the workshop. |
| Massachusetts | Group services available to all customers of FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield a comprehensive *career transition seminar*; other *specialized seminars* and strategy sessions on a range of topics to support reemployment; and *organized job search teams* targeted to individuals facing specific barriers, such as older job-seekers. |
| Texas | Group workshops and seminars available at no cost to the general public at the Lake Jackson Center include a *total image update* workshop in which participants learn how to dress for interviews and careers while remaining true to their personalities and budgets; *money management* seminars that help participants learn how to manage their budgets, especially when their personal financial situations have changed; a *stress management* seminar that teaches how to cope with the stress of unemployment and the job search process; an *exploring career options* seminar that covers areas such as making use of career interest surveys, exploring interest areas, and choosing careers; and a *job search* seminar that covers implementing job search plans and using Center and community resources in the job search process. |

**Exhibit 9-3** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Wisconsin | Among the many workshops available is one evening workshop for students and their parents on career planning designed by local partners. Based on the belief that parents are the primary influence on students' career planning, this very popular workshop is called "Parents-as-Partners." |

## Exhibit 9-4
## Examples of Enhanced Job-Search Support

| | |
|---|---|
| Texas | In Lake Jackson, part of the One-Stop grant was used to purchase equipment that could be used by all Center customers, including computers for a shared resource room and front entrance area and fax and copy machines available to all Center customers. The grant also enabled the Center to purchase software, video materials, and reference books for the resource room and subscribe to publications for the resource room. In Arlington, the resource room offers universal access to the Job Bank, computers, a phone bank, and fax machines, and is one of the most popular services offered at the center. |
| Connecticut | Job search support in New London and Willimantic includes assistance for all customers with writing resumes and universal access to faxes, phone bank, copiers, the job and talent banks, information on scholarships and career training, and labor market information. |
| Minnesota | The partners at the Anoka Workforce Center have developed a service delivery strategy to reach as wide a population as possible and have achieved a high level of visibility to a broad customer base. In addition to the automated services available to all interested customers within the career resource room, all customers have access to computer-scanning of resumes, a phone bank as well as self-service copy and fax machines. |

was aimed at older customers who were changing careers. This center also encouraged other groups with similar interests to establish clubs and provided space in which they could meet, even if staff were not available to facilitate the club.

### GOAL 5. PROVIDING MORE INTENSIVE TRAINING AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

All of the centers in our sample helped customers access more intensive education and training programs for which they were eligible. In Exhibit 9-5, we detail the ways in which various sites make training and services available.

In the majority of One-Stop centers in our study, JTPA Titles II and III provided the bulk of funding for specialized training services. In centers that included welfare-to-work programs, this funding stream was also available for welfare recipients. In some centers located in areas of declining industries, Trade Adjustment Assistance Program was also an important source of training funding.

Centers helped clients access training in three ways. First, some centers provided some training options directly. Most commonly, these sites provided basic educational skills on-site, staffed by local adult education programs. A few centers provided some training in occupational skills on site. For example, in Columbia, Maryland, dislocated workers needing retraining could attend on-site evening classes provided by the local community college.

Second, some sites provided financial support for training offered by training providers in the community. Although some centers contracted directly with providers for services to their JTPA and JOBS customers, the trend was to provide eligible customers with tuition assistance for training offered by approved providers.

For example, the Baltimore center's JTPA program was moving away from directly contracting with providers. As part of its Career Management Accounts demonstration, customers researched and developed their own training plans. They then interviewed various training providers and at least two employers to ensure that they had adequate information about the career they intended to pursue. Customers were then issued training vouchers and chose among several approved public and proprietary vendors for their training.

Third, many sites helped customers access training through referral to alternative training options in the community. This could include referrals to off-site ABE/GED

## Exhibit 9-5
## Examples of Training Services

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Through referrals to off-site education partners, all center customers also have access to adult basic education, ESL, and GED courses. Additional training services are available only to customers funded under specific categorical programs in both New London and Willimantic. Customers qualifying for these programs can receive assistance in developing an individualized training or education plan, tuition assistance to participate in approved training, and financial aid counseling. |
| Iowa | At the Creston and Des Moines centers, placement in work experience or on-the-job training are reserved for participants in JTPA programs. Tuition and supportive service payments are generally also available for both JOBS and JTPA but, due to funding shortages, no new customers have been enrolled in occupational training through the JOBS programs for the two years prior to the site visit. |
| Indiana | In Indianapolis new users may also be scheduled for a job training or employment counseling interview. Authorization of vouchers and referral to vocational training and on-the-job training are available for those eligible for additional support services.<br>In Lawrenceburg, referrals to available community services, including training resources and supportive services, are provided by reception and career specialist staff. |
| Maryland | In Baltimore, training in basic educational skills and occupational skills is reserved for JTPA customers, who can receive classroom training, on-the-job or customized training. The center's JTPA administrators are, however, moving away from directly contracting with providers toward a system in which they issue training vouchers and individual referrals to a large list of approved public and proprietary training vendors. Under a Career Management Accounts demonstration, Career Center customers can now research and develop individualized training plans. The application process requires customers to interview training providers as well as two employers in the field to ensure that they are informed about the work environment and type of work involved.<br>In Columbia, customers needing training are referred to on-site JTPA staff for eligibility determination, assessment, and service planning. Evening classes for JTPA customers are provided on-site by the local community college. College staff also provide on-site ABE and GED classes once a week. |

**Exhibit 9-5** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Massachusetts | The most notable program/funding streams not yet consolidated into One-Stop career center operations at the state level are JTPA Title II funds for services to economically disadvantaged individuals and Title III funds for dislocated worker services.<br>The Springfield center administers only a small amount of JTPA Title II funds because when they opened the One-Stop, two-year JTPA service delivery contracts were already underway with other providers. Through a network of local institutional partners, community-based organizations, and area education and training providers, career specialists make referrals to persons eligible for JTPA, Trade Adjustment Assistance, welfare-to-work programs, Job Corps, veterans' employment services, vocational rehabilitation services, and other state and federal programs. These specialists assess the availability of funds in these programs, assist customers through the application and approval process, and conduct follow-ups to ensure customer satisfaction with program services.<br>The center also offers enhanced or fee-based services on-site such as SCANS skills training for customers who are changing careers or are employed by firms that are implementing team-based management practices. Advanced computer literacy courses are available on-site, and ESL, ABE, and GED training are available according to customer demand. |
| Minnesota | Training services available at the Anoka Center include JTPA based services such as classroom training and supportive services. All customers may receive adult basic education, and GED and ESL instruction, and referrals to educational providers. |
| Texas | At both the Arlington and Lake Jackson centers, specialized staff offer all JTPA and JOBS services.<br>Because the Arlington Career Center originated as a JTPA-funded facility and JTPA still pays for the majority of staff stationed at the Center, JTPA eligibility is a requirement for access to most of these services. For customers qualifying program funding, training services include tuition assistance in approved training and a variety of support services including transportation assistance. Goodwill offers on-site computer training classes, and ESL and ABE classes are offered on-site in the evenings. |
| Wisconsin | Education and job training services are available to individuals eligible for the JTPA or JOBS programs through contracted service providers housed at the center, through the technical college, and through other community and educational institutions. |

instruction, computer courses available free-of-charge through non-profit or other community-based organizations, or job search workshops offered by professional associations or unions for job-seekers in particular occupational fields.

Many of the sites also emphasized the importance of developing strong referral arrangements to link One-Stop customers with needed social, health, and supportive services provided by agencies outside the core One-Stop partnership. To facilitate these referral linkages, local sites often developed interagency memoranda of understanding that delineated common criteria and procedures for making referrals, scheduling customer appointments, sharing information across agencies, and providing coordinated or joint case management to customers served by more than one agency.

## GOAL 6. PROVIDING TARGETED POPULATIONS WITH SPECIALIZED SERVICES

Many centers developed customized services or enhanced referral networks to enhance their ability to meet the needs of customers with special needs, such as veterans, individuals with disabilities, youth, older workers, and welfare recipients.

### Services for Veterans

Exhibit 9-6 presents examples of services to veterans. In most centers, staff responsible for delivering Veterans Employment and Training Services were on-site. In addition, some centers, particularly in areas near large military bases, offered special outreach services to military personnel contemplating re-entry into the civilian labor force. For example, staff in one center went to a nearby submarine base once a month to conduct a 2-day workshop intended to help enlisted men and women manage the transition to civilian employment.

Because of funding regulations, veterans' representatives are generally not allowed to work with non-veteran customers. As a result, they did not generally participate in many of the cross-training activities intended to promote a wider understanding of the range of programs available at One-Stop centers or through referrals to other agencies.

However, in two of the smaller centers we visited, veterans' representatives were freed from some of these restrictions, which allowed them to become better aware of center activities. For example, the Willimantic veterans' representative had participated in a pilot program under a federal waiver that allowed him to cross-train and administer Employment Services to all customers. Although the pilot period had

**Exhibit 9-6**

### Examples of Specialized Services to Targeted Populations

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | Veterans Employment Services are offered by full-time veterans representatives at both sites. The New London veteran representative also offers a Transition Assistance Program (TAPS), a 2-day workshop every month for enlisted men and women intended to them manage the transition to civilian employment. |
| Iowa | VETS services were offered through the state's Job Services at both sites. In Des Moines, individuals with disabilities could also receive job placement and on-the-job training assistance through one of the center's key partners, Goodwill Industries. The local community college also leased space at the Des Moines center for ABE and GED classes. |
| Indiana | In Indianapolis, full-time veterans' services staff provide employment and training service for veterans.<br>The veterans' representative at the Lawrenceburg Center works with veterans half-time, with the remainder of his time devoted to case management and other office-wide responsibilities. This has allowed the Veterans' representative the opportunity to engage in cross-training, enabling him to perform any function in the center. The veterans' representative believes that this wider experience also benefits veterans customers. |
| Maryland | Veterans' representatives offer employment, training, and case management services at both Maryland sites. |
| Minnesota | Special services available at the Anoka Center include rehabilitation services, services for the blind, VETS, and Older Worker Programs. These specialized services include in-depth testing and assessment, personal profiling for labor marketing viability, income support, training in career decision-making skills, career counseling, case management, training assistance, classroom training, supportive services, training in job search skills, monthly payments on earned income credit, and follow-up services.<br>Other services available through co-located partners include sheltered work environment for persons with developmental disabilities. |
| Ohio | Because of its rural nature, the Wood County center provides services to populations with special needs primarily through referrals to other organizations including a Veterans Assistance Center, United Christian Fellowship, and child care providers |

**Exhibit 9-6** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Texas | At both the Arlington and Lake Jackson centers, specialized staff offer Food Stamp Employment and Training Services, Veterans' Employment and Training Services. |
| Wisconsin | Veterans' services, including job counseling and assistance, are available through co-located veterans' staff. |

ended at the time of the site visit, this experience provided the representative with an opportunity to learn about and link veterans to the wide range of assistance available to job-seekers in the center.

### Services for Individuals with Disabilities

Although all One-Stop center staff expressed commitment to serving persons with disabilities, they had not yet developed strategic approaches for integrating services for this population into the service delivery system. Although about half of the centers included on-site representatives of vocational rehabilitation programs, services offered by staff from that program were often provided separately from other services. One-Stop staff continually cited confidentiality issues and the absence of an integrated funding stream as barriers to integrating services for persons with disabilities.

Despite these barriers, however, a few One-Stop Centers did attempt to provide interfaces to self-access technologies that were designed specifically for special-needs populations. These enhancements included enlarged screens and high-volume headsets. One center indicated that when customers who require special services visit the center, they all assigned an escort to assist them in accessing services and ensuring that their particular needs are met.

### Services for Youth

Although most One-Stop sites had not yet operationalized services specifically designed for youth, coordinating with school-to-work and other activities that would appeal to young people was a clear priority in all of the sites we visited. One-Stop staff saw great potential in such initiatives and were interested in sharing their newly acquired access to high-quality and relevant labor market information with local educational institutions.

One-Stop centers approached the development of these services using three strategies. First, some One-Stop centers were developing partnerships with local school districts to develop a variety of career education services for students. For the most part, these partnerships were in the early stages of development at the time we conducted site visits.

For example, in the Waukesha (Wisconsin) One-Stop center, a non-profit organization called Partners for Education, which represented local school districts, worked with other partners to develop an evening workshop for students and their parents on career planning and development. The workshop, called "Parents-as-

Partners," has been very popular; scheduled workshops are full, and the center maintains a waiting list for future ones.

The Anoka County center in Minnesota worked with five school districts and other local partners in securing a $650,000 school-to-work grant. An early objective of the center was to inform the education community about the quality and importance of services available at the center. Toward that end, the center is establishing electronic linkages between the schools and the workforce development agencies, making high-quality labor market and career planning information available to all students to supplement their school-based career education courses.

Second, some centers have established relationships directly with school staff to develop services to supplement existing career education resources or curricula. For example, the center in Lawrenceburg, Indiana, has worked with teachers to enhance the career education curriculum in grades eight and nine, and has developed structured opportunities for students to visit the center on a regular basis throughout their school careers.

Third, some centers developed services that were designed to appeal to youth. For example, the center in Springfield, Massachusetts, developed a sophisticated resource area that was very appealing to youth. While on-site, we interviewed young people who originally had come to the center to apply for specific jobs but had returned to explore the services available in the resource room. This center was also working closely with employers from whom local youth often seek work. Although this center had not yet begun to actively market its services to youth, its services had already become popular with young One-Stop customers.

### Services for Older Workers

Older job-seekers represent a high-priority group for some centers. These sites used three strategies to serve older workers.

First, some sites included the Title V program as a partner to ensure access to these services in One-Stop centers. The Title V representatives were an important means of linking customers to services because many customers had worked with their Title V representatives outside of the One-Stop environment. Housing the Title V program in One-Stop Centers provides customers with a sense of continuity in services.

Second, several sites we visited employed Title V participants as trainees within their One-Stop centers. These older workers either assisted customers in accessing services in the resource rooms or in registering on the automated systems. Center staff indicated that this had been an effective strategy in helping customers unfamiliar with new technologies, including many older customers, overcome their fear of using them.

Third, some centers designed workshops or seminars tailored to the needs of older workers. In one site, staff were developing a workshop entitled "Turning Your Volunteer Activities into a Job," which was designed to help seniors identify the skills they used in their daily unpaid activities and market those skills to potential employers. Job clubs were also very popular among seniors.

### Services for Welfare Recipients

All of the sites we visited were actively involved in planning or implementing welfare-to-work efforts in their states and local areas, but the level of direct involvement in providing services to welfare customers through One-Stop centers varied substantially. Direct involvement of welfare-to-work agencies was greater in states where the agencies responsible for ES and UI were also responsible for the JOBS programs. In other cases, state-level agreements permitted or facilitated cooperation between workforce development and welfare-to-work agencies. For example, in one state, an agreement mandated that the One-Stop centers would be the designated providers of employment and training services for individuals transitioning off public assistance, and state funds were transferred accordingly. Further, some local sites had forged their own local-level agreements. As a result of these various coordination arrangements, in 11 of the 14 One-Stop centers we visited, staff from the agencies responsible for providing welfare-to-work services were co-located or maintained on-site presence at the center.

Most sites were experimenting with different approaches to serving welfare customers in a One-Stop environment. Many had developed services aimed at removing these customers' barriers to employment. These services included providing publications or printed materials designed for customers transitioning into paid employment, offering customized workshops or seminars, and providing case-management and follow-up activities that were more intensive than those offered to non-welfare customers.

Several examples of One-Stop Centers developing innovative approaches to serving welfare customers are described below.

- The Waukesha Workforce Development Center in Wisconsin has a cooperative, multi-agency endeavor to assist a broad range of job seekers in securing steady employment. Recognizing that child care is a barrier to many job-seekers, the Center contracted with the local YWCA to provide on-site child care for all Center customers. Although all customers may use this service, staff recognize that welfare customers, who do not typically have child care options, benefited from this service.
- The center in Springfield, Massachusetts, has developed an orientation program specifically designed to assist welfare customers transition into full- or part-time employment. Although the orientation is open to all customers, it places more emphasis on the issues of self-esteem and overcoming fundamental barriers (i.e. finding clothing for an interview) than does the main orientation. The center is also developing a series of workshops to assist welfare-to-work customers in achieving self-sufficiency.
- In Columbia, Maryland, the One-Stop center worked with a broad coalition of social service organization and community-based organizations to develop a local welfare-to-work initiative intended to prevent individuals from needing welfare at all. This program, Jobs First, is rooted in a commitment to provide high-quality intensive services from the day customers register for services, thereby preventing these individuals from "falling through the cracks."
- The Anoka County One-Stop Center in Minnesota worked with local partners to develop a program designed to assist unemployed or underemployed non-custodial parents find gainful employment that will enable them to fulfill their child-support obligations. This program, called the Minnesota Parents' Fair Share program, is intended to support families, not just individuals, in their efforts to become self-sufficient.

In addition, in two sites, local One-Stop partnerships grew out of previous collaboration between the JOBS and JTPA programs. In Des Moines, JTPA contracted with the state to provide services to customers of the state's welfare-to-work program. In Wood County, Ohio, JOBS and JTPA staff were already co-located when they began planning the One-Stop initiative. As a result of these partners' experience and expertise in welfare-to-work programs, services appropriate for welfare customers comprised the core of One-Stop services in both sites.

## GOAL 7. MAKING SERVICES CONVENIENT TO ACCESS

States and local areas have also adopted a number of strategies to make it physically easier for customers to access the services offered in One-Stop centers. These strategies include locating centers conveniently, extending hours of operation, and offering remote electronic access to One-Stop services.

### Increasing Geographic Accessibility

States and local areas have adopted four basic strategies to ensure that One-Stop services are available to people within a wide geographic area: (1) performing community outreach; (2) locating One-Stop centers so that they are easily accessible to targeted populations; (3) establishing satellite centers with guided access to automated services; and (4) ensuring that centers are well served by public transportation. Exhibit 9-7 provides examples of how study sites improved the geographical accessibility of their workforce development services.

Several states have explicitly encouraged One-Stop centers to conduct community outreach at remote locations. For example, Minnesota encouraged outreach to rural communities through "mobile" offices. In other cases, centers developed their own outreach strategies. For example, staff in Creston, Iowa, regularly traveled to offices of government agencies, community-based organizations, and schools in outlying areas to provide services throughout their rural community.

In several urban and suburban areas, One-Stop networks have been developed to serve the needs of diverse communities. For example, Baltimore's One-Stop partners have formed a network of full-service centers. Further, using funding from the local Empowerment Zone initiative, Baltimore planned to open six satellite "village centers" in high-poverty areas of the city, to be staffed by community-based organizations.

In a similar effort, Tarrant County, Texas, established a network of seven career centers and three satellite offices to serve various communities within the county. Because there was no public transportation in one city, a network of smaller centers was seen as a particularly appropriate strategy for providing customers convenient access to centers.

In other cases, centers had coordinated with local transit authorities to ensure bus service to centers. Efforts by One-Stop staff in places such as Anoka County, Minnesota, and Indianapolis, Indiana, have been successful in bringing public transportation to their sites. Other centers were fortunate in being able to locate in

## Exhibit 9-7
## Examples of Making Services Geographically Accessible

| | |
|---|---|
| Iowa | To make services accessible throughout rural areas, some One-Stop centers have made arrangements for center staff to travel on a regular basis to satellite service sites operated by One-Stop partners or coordinating social service agencies. Customers can thus access workforce development services at sites close to their homes, rather than having to travel to the One-Stop center itself.<br>Creston Center staff, for example, have developed a network of remote service locations throughout a seven-county region. These locations include offices of government agencies, community-based organizations, and schools. Staff travel to these locations on a regular basis to meet with customers who cannot travel to Creston for services. |
| Indiana | The state plans to have at least one One-Stop center in each service delivery area, with a comprehensive career center within 50 miles of every Indiana resident. Customers have the option of receiving services at any of the state's One-Stop centers. In addition to the state's planned full One-Stop Centers, where core services will be accessible in a single physical location, there will be electronically linked One-Stop satellites. These satellite sites will take a variety of different forms, including: staffed offices and electronic linkages with college placement centers, schools and other entities.<br>The three centers in Marion County are easily accessible for most Indianapolis residents. The Eastside Indianapolis Center provides free parking, and the center director was successful in lobbying for regular bus service to the Center. |
| Maryland | In Baltimore, staff intend to market center services to the residents in Baltimore's high poverty and minority neighborhoods. As part of the Empowerment Zone initiative, equipment and software will be installed in six satellite village centers that will be staffed by community-based organizations, as well as in full-service One-Stop centers. If they operate as envisioned, village centers will be a key link in making career center services accessible to all Baltimore residents. |
| Massachusetts | Customers have a choice of at least two career centers in each region. |

**Exhibit 9-7** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Minnesota | The state strongly advocates that local partners extend Center access, when appropriate, through mobile outreach to rural communities.<br>The Anoka Center, located in the area north of the Twin Cities, is easily accessible by automobile from most locations in the Twin Cities area. Although it is served by two bus routes, bus riders in some outlying areas must travel through downtown Minneapolis to come to the Center. |
| Texas | Both Texas sites in the sample were part of local or regional network of Career Centers. The Arlington Center is part of a network of seven career centers and three satellite offices developed in Tarrant County as part of the One-Stop career center initiative. The Lake Jackson Career Center is one of four existing and two planned One-Stop centers in the 13-county Houston-Galveston "Gulf Coast" area of Texas that relies heavily on rural outreach. |
| Wisconsin | The Waukesha Center is conveniently located on the Technical College campus, which is near a major interstate and served Waukesha County by public transportation. |

areas that were already well served by public transportation. For example, the Waukesha (Wisconsin) One-Stop center is located within the campus of a technical college that is served by an existing bus route.

Massachusetts has adopted another approach to promoting geographic accessibility. The state has mandated that at least two full-service One-Stop centers be available in each service delivery area so that customers can choose both the most convenient location as well as the center that offers them the most appropriate services.

### Extending Service Hours

Many of the study sites were considering extending hours of service in the evenings and on weekends to better serve customers who were currently employed but wanted to upgrade their skills or find better jobs. At the time of our site visits, however, only four of the fourteen sites were open evenings and weekends. The experiences of these centers are presented in Exhibit 9-8.

Although partners supported extended service hours at other sites, a number of barriers precluded them from extending their hours. These barriers included union restrictions on working evenings and weekends; lack of funding to support the additional staff time that would be necessary; and problems related to the facilities, such as the need to negotiate off-hour access with landlords or provide adequate security.

### Providing Remote Access to Services

In most areas, customers had remote access to information services through electronic links to labor market information systems. At the time of the site visits, all states had either fully operational systems or were very close to being able to offer such services, as shown in Exhibit 9-9. All of these planned and operational systems allowed customers to access updated state job listings by dialing on to the Internet, and many were linked to national job databases, such as America's Job Bank.

States provided a variety of types of information on-line. In Minnesota, for example, customers could access information about the sectors of the economy that were expanding in each region of the state. Customers could then use this information to help choose the type of training or education that would qualify them for jobs in these sectors. Other states, such as Connecticut and Massachusetts, also provided on-line access to Talent Banks that allowed customers to prepare and post their resumes. Connecticut also entered into a formal agreement with the state library system to establish

## Exhibit 9-8
## Examples of Extended Service Hours

| | |
|---|---|
| Massachusetts | The FutureWorks Center, in addition to adopting extended hours one evening during the week and Saturday morning remains open beyond its normal operating hours for special projects such as job fairs or pre-arranged tours of the facilities. |
| Minnesota | The state promotes evening and weekend hours of operation to accommodate employed individuals who may wish to explore further career options. The Anoka Center provides extended hours of service to assist current workers and to increase the accessibility of Human Service Center-based classes in ESL, GED, and adult basic education. |
| Texas | The Arlington Center provides extended hours of service three evenings a week, in order to reach working and under-employed persons looking for opportunities to upgrade skills or change careers, as well as to offer increased customer access to Center-based classes in ESL and computer instruction. |
| Wisconsin | A focus group participant who was a veteran about to lose his long-held job at a major area employer especially appreciated the fact that the Waukesha Center offered evening and weekend hours and that it was one example of how Center staff "bend over backwards" to assist customers. |

### Exhibit 9-9
### Examples of Remote Access to Electronic One-Stop Services

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | A statewide Internet workforce information network has been developed by the Connecticut Department of Labor, providing remote access by customers to services and information; the state One-Stop system (*Connecticut Works*) has also developed a partnership with the state library system, which has resulted in the establishment of "mini-career centers" in libraries, linked libraries to the *Connecticut Works* home page and electronic network, and enabled One-Stop centers to draw on the information and support services available to state residents through the library system. |
| Iowa | Customers with home computers may access the state's Data Center through a modem, or they may access the state's World Wide Web site from local libraries, universities, or from any home or institution with access to the Internet. There are also several stand-alone kiosks throughout the state that run a touch-screen version of America's Labor Exchange (ALEX) to which customers also have convenient access. |
| Indiana | In addition to its network of full-service One-Stop centers, additional service access points will include staffed and unstaffed One-Stop satellite locations linked electronically to career centers via computer, telephone, or fax. The state also plans to make ALEX available via several kiosks located in public places. |
| Maryland | Providing remote access was a key priority during second-year One-Stop implementation. Among other initiatives, the state planned to make a "labor market information bank" available to anyone with a computer and a modem. |
| Massachusetts | The state has developed a statewide electronic interactive Job Bank that can be accessed through the state's Web page, allowing individuals access to job descriptions and application procedures. The state is also in the process of developing a Talent Bank, an education and training database, a labor market information database, all of which should be available through remote access. |
| Minnesota | The Workforce Center system in Minnesota also allows all residents to access automated One-Stop information services through bulletin board and Internet systems from their homes as well as from public institutions such as libraries. The system's Internet home page offers access to job listings and regional labor market information. |

**Exhibit 9-9** (Continued)

| | |
|---|---|
| Ohio | Much of the state's systems development during the second and third years of implementation was focused on a range of user-friendly information systems. Products under development included a remotely accessible skills-based automated job matching system (JobNet). The state also planned to link this system with information on employment and training providers through the Ohio Career Information System (OCIS), as well as providing links to other community services. |
| Texas | Job listings can be accessed from remote home or business locations, and through "Job Express" kiosks located in shopping centers and other areas of high pedestrian traffic in many areas throughout the state. The Texas Workforce Commission's home page also offers links to the Governor's Job Bank (for state employment opportunities) and America's Job Bank, as well as to labor market information and education providers. |
| Wisconsin | The Department of Workforce Development's Internet page provides links to the state's JobNet system as well as access to labor market information, job search pamphlets, and links to the state's career centers and school-to-work networks. |

"mini-career information centers" in most libraries that included terminals electronically linked to the state's information system. Ohio planned to provide on-line access to information on employment and training providers and other community services.

Several states also helped local areas finance user-friendly job-information "kiosks" that were located in areas of high pedestrian traffic, such as shopping malls. These kiosks tended to be more popular in rural areas, where staff viewed them as alternative vehicles for providing services to customers who might not come into the centers. They have also proven valuable as marketing devices to make potential customers aware of the public services available to them.

For the most part, however, staff indicated that kiosks had not been effective in providing services, and were too expensive to keep simply as a marketing tool. Staff reported several problems with these stand-alone facilities: (1) because they were not electronically linked to the state database, staff had to travel to these remote sites to manually update them; (2) they were not reliable and required excessive maintenance; and (3) it was difficult to monitor customer use because they attracted young children and teens who were not necessarily using the services as intended but were counted as customers by the system. Several sites that were using kiosks at the time of our visit have since removed them.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN PROVIDING SERVICES TO INDIVIDUAL CUSTOMERS

The One-Stop centers that we studied have made substantial progress in developing services for individual customers that are better integrated, offer more choices, and meet the needs of a diverse set of customers. These accomplishments include:

- *Simplifying access.* Many One-Stop centers have taken important steps to simplify customers' access to workforce development services. All centers provide a single point of access to services, and a large majority of sites orient customs to the range of services available.
- *Integrating intake.* A few sites have integrated their initial intake and eligibility determination procedures. Rather than having to provide the same information to multiple service providers, customers can provide the information once and have their eligibility for a variety of programs determined at the same time.

- *Providing a wide range of services.* By offering a "tiered" service delivery system, One-Stop centers were often able to tailor services to meet the needs of a wide variety of customers, regardless of their program eligibility.
- *Providing effective self-access services.* In an increasing number of sites, customers could access automated information about the local labor market, job requirements, and community resources through which they could pursue further training and education. An increasing number of sites offered automated job listings that customers could access directly. In many sites, resource specialists were available to assist customers who were unfamiliar with the new technologies.
- *Providing more intensive career planning and job search assistance.* A number of sites also offered enhanced job search support, often developed from partners' experience with dislocated worker services. This support included more intensive assessment and career counseling and staff assistance with job search. Workshops on career planning, life skills, and job search techniques were also available at many centers. Sites varied considerably, however, in the extent to which these additional services were available to the general public.
- *Providing access to education and training services.* All centers helped program-eligible customers locate appropriate training and education opportunities through JTPA programs, and many centers also offered specialized services for customers moving from welfare to work. Centers also helped customers by offering referrals to other training options, such as adult basic education or computer training available at little or no cost.
- *Convenient services.* Many One-Stop centers systems have also developed a number of strategies to make services more convenient. Some have located their centers in sites that are easily accessible and well served by public transportation. A few centers also offer weekend and evening service hours to better serve employed customers. Many One-Stop systems have taken advantage of electronic communication technology to provide access to quality information from remote locations.

### Factors that Influenced the Provision of Services to Individual Customers

A number of key factors influenced the ability of One-Stop centers to meet their goals in providing services to individual customers:

- *The types of technology and information available.* As a result of investments in technology infrastructure and reference materials, many One-Stop centers dramatically increased the availability and quality of information available to guide job seekers. These improvements in technology also freed staff time that could be devoted to those needing more intensive services. These changes allowed centers to offer more services to the general public than prior to the implementation of the One-Stop initiative.

- *The breadth of partnership.* The types of partners and their level of involvement affected the services offered to individual customers. Some One-Stop Centers are more narrowly focused on workforce development services while others have broadened their focus to include a broad range of social services. Particularly important are whether partners maintain an on-site presence at One-Stop centers, the ways partners coordinate or integrate services, and the way partners communicate about their vision and experiences.
- *Choices about co-location and consolidation.* Local One-Stop partners have developed a variety of collaborative approaches to improve the coordination of services provided to customers including (1) functional integration and cross-staffing of units providing services and (2) continued "specialization" by partners with coordination of referrals and smooth "hand-offs" of customers among partner staff.
- *Historical relationships.* Partners that had long and successful histories of collaborating to serve mutual customers generally experienced fewer "turf" disputes under One-Stop implementation, and have been able to move more quickly toward the goals of reducing duplication and providing more integrated services. The history of collaboration also influenced the design of procedures to enable individuals to access appropriate services in an efficient, seamless, and user-friendly fashion.

## Continuing Challenges and Next Steps

Despite a number of important accomplishments, several challenges in designing effective services to individuals remain for many of the emerging One-Stop centers. These challenges revolve around three major areas related to services to individuals: (1) integrating and supporting new technologies into One-Stop centers; (2) adapting service delivery for greater universal access; and (3) improving services to customers with special needs.

### Supporting New Technologies

The new emphasis on self-access technologies in One-Stop centers represents a significant shift in the delivery of services. Although the states and local One-Stop centers have made tremendous progress in making these services available to customers, they continue to face some key challenges in improving the quality and accessibility of these technologies. These challenges include:

- *Making decisions about which products individual customers perceive to be most useful.* Although some sites conducted focus groups and surveys to assess the needs of individual customers and select self-access products that appear to meet those needs, in some cases not as many customers used these products as expected. For example, kiosks did not reach the customers that staff intended to target with this technology.
- *Developing user-friendly interfaces that appeal to individual customers and keep them coming back.* In some states and local sites, staff made considerable efforts to develop user-friendly interfaces In other cases, however, customers—and in some cases staff—remained unfamiliar with some of the new self-service technologies.
- *Providing an appropriate level of staff assistance to help customers use technology and other self-access resources.* Knowledgeable staff are needed to help customers who have had little experience with computer programs or networks. At centers in which staff could assist customers, these technology-based services proved extremely popular. In centers that provided less assistance, however, the new technologies were less well used.

### Adapting Services for a Universal Customer Base

Although many of the centers highlighted in this chapter have found ways to expand the range of services available to customers not eligible for specific programs, funding these services remains a major challenge in One-Stop centers. Center respondents consistently referred to the need to balance the goal of providing universal access to services with the goal of meeting the needs of special targeted populations.

In many cases, expanding services to the general public was done in small steps, building on existing services previously reserved for targeted populations and gradually expanding access to all customers. Although a few centers now offer most group activities and workshop to all customers, regardless of program eligibility, most centers still require that customers be enrolled in specific programs to access these services.

To be better prepared to respond to the federal goal of universality, emerging One-Stop centers need help and guidance in finding ways to ensure that program eligibility requirements do not unnecessarily restrict their ability to offer more intensive assistance to all customers.

### Serving Customers with Special Needs

Centers offered a wide range of education and training to customers who needed more intensive assistance to become job-ready. In all sites, JTPA partners actively linked customers to training, education, and employment opportunities. In most centers, JTPA funds paid for the bulk of specialized training to less job-ready customers.

A large majority of sites also offered VETS programs on-site. However, a continuing challenge for One-Stop systems is finding ways to use the considerable expertise of veteran's representatives to enhance the services of the One-Stop as a whole, while at the same promoting the goal of helping veterans find employment and training opportunities.

Few strategic approaches had been developed to provide integrated services to customers with disabilities. Although about half of the study sites had vocational rehabilitation services on-site, services to these customers were often provided in isolation from "mainstream" One-Stop services. Because vocation rehabilitation services were often self-contained, many local and state respondents believed that they had missed an opportunity to draw on the expertise of vocational rehabilitation partners to assist the One-Stop as a whole in areas such as ADA compliance and redesigning One-Stop services to better serve the needs of customers with disabilities.

With the exception of offering JTPA-funded youth programs, few sites had developed integrated strategies for youth. Several local areas, however, have received school-to-work implementation grants, and these areas envisioned using the local One-Stop system as the primary "hub" for school-to-work activities and programs. These systems will, however, face the considerable challenge of making services designed primarily for adult workers more appropriate for youth. Some centers have already begun this process by forming career exploration and job readiness workshops specifically targeted to youth.

By far the most important challenge for the One-Stop centers over the next several years will be to find ways to effectively serve a rapidly increasing number of welfare customers who need jobs and training opportunities. Although most sites offered access to welfare-to-work programs on-site, One-Stop centers varied in the extent to which they were preparing to serve welfare customers. In some instances, local welfare agencies were developing "parallel" workforce development systems and ignoring the potential of the emerging One-Stop system to address the needs of welfare customers. Coordinating the One-Stop system with the welfare-to-work system, therefore, will be a challenging next step for those sites.

# 10. ONE-STOP SERVICES FOR EMPLOYERS

## INTRODUCTION

The success of local One-Stop systems depends on their ability to both help employers find qualified workers and help job seekers prepare for and enter high-quality jobs with career potential. Both employers and job seekers are facing new challenges in the global economy, as a result of rapid changes in work-place technology and the skills required of workers. In an expanding economy in which local unemployment rates often hover between three to five percent—down from eight to ten percent a decade ago—careful attention to current and projected employer needs is essential if One-Stop systems are to succeed in balancing the needs of employer and job-seeker customers.

Many firms require high-quality affordable services to help them recruit, screen, select, and train qualified workers for new job openings. Over the last decade, a number of firms have reduced their internal capacity to conduct staff hiring and training by trimming staff from their human resources divisions. As a result, many firms have begun obtaining from labor-market intermediaries a variety of staffing-related services—including help in recruiting, screening, and training new staff, leasing workers to staff functions that had previously been carried out by regular employees, and out-sourcing work previously performed internally.

Employers are also seeking assistance in training incumbent workers for evolving job responsibilities in the rapidly changing workplace. Increasingly, employers are encouraging or requiring current employees to upgrade their skills over time to keep up with changing workplace demands. They are looking for assistance from public and private training providers in developing and delivering customized training to members of their current workforce.

The objective of most One-Stop systems is to promote local economic growth and vitality by making it easier for employers to meet their hiring and staff development needs. However, to succeed in marketing their services to employers, One-Stop partners often have to overcome widespread employer dissatisfaction with previous public sector labor exchange and training programs.[1] Many employers have expressed frustration with public-sector workforce development agencies, complaining that staff were unresponsive to their needs and that the services they received were confusing and duplicative, required excessive paperwork, and resulted in the referral of inappropriate job applicants.

One-Stop systems have taken on the challenge of changing employers' low opinions of public workforce development services by redesigning "core" labor exchange services for employers. They have also begun developing a number of "enhanced" employer services—including management assistance, intensive recruitment and applicant screening for large-scale hiring efforts, and designing and conducting customized training for incumbent workers.

In this chapter, we describe (1) how the One-Stop states and case study sites have developed new objectives for designing and delivering services to employers, (2) the specific services developed to further each of these goals, and (3) the challenges faced and accomplishments achieved by these sites in transforming workforce development systems to better meet employers' needs.

## GOALS FOR TRANSFORMING EMPLOYER SERVICES

Strategies for improving employer services have been developed to address several goals:

1. Redefining the employer as a core customer of the public workforce development system.
2. Providing simplified access to an integrated menu of employer services.
3. Linking employers to high quality information responsive to their needs and interests.
4. Improving the quality of labor exchange services for employers.
5. Offering enhanced employer services on a fee-for-service basis (and free of charge to firms that qualify for special assistance).

---

[1] One-Stop planners in one large metropolitan area which conducted a survey of local employers found that only about 10% of area employers used the public labor exchange system. Furthermore, most employers that listed hourly jobs with public workforce development services did not consider public sector services when seeking individuals to fill salaried positions.

## GOAL 1. REDEFINING THE EMPLOYER AS A CORE CUSTOMER OF THE WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT SYSTEM

Case study sites recognized that they needed to redesign their basic employer services—even core services available free of charge—to attract a larger share of the employer market. To convince a wide range of employers to use One-Stop services when they needed staffing-related services, One-Stop centers had to reassure local employers that they would receive services that compared favorably with the help they could purchase from private labor market intermediaries. One of the keys to getting many employers to try the services available from One-Stop centers was to convince employers that they were important and valued customers of the public workforce development system.

Two strategies were found to be useful in convincing employers that they were key customers of the new One-Stop service system: (1) ensuring that One-Stop system partners understood the needs and interests of current and potential employer customers; and (2) ensuring that One-Stop career center staff were prepared to offer employer-friendly services.

### Ensuring that One-Stop System Partners Understand the Needs of Employer Customers

Most case study sites used a step-by-step approach to gain a better understanding of employers' needs, beginning with formal and informal employer needs analyses and surveys of current business practices and requirements. During the One-Stop proposal development period and during the first implementation year, almost all local sites surveyed members of the business community to (1) ascertain their labor-exchange needs, (2) assess their opinion of the ability of the public sector system to satisfy those needs, and (3) obtain their suggestions about how to improve services offered to employers.

For example, the Indianapolis Private Industry Council commissioned a private firm to conduct a study of how local employers perceived the public workforce development system. The results of the study—which showed that a large group of employers did not currently use the public labor-exchange system—demonstrated the need for redesigned employer services. Employers indicated that they needed a quicker response to job orders listed by employers and wanted a single contact person or customer service representative assigned to each firm. In Maryland, a state-level Employer Access Workgroup conducted 18 "employer dialogues" to engage 400 employers in discussions about the state's workforce development system relative to employer requirements. One result was the development of a plan for a distinct "employer access cluster" which will allow employers to dial up a bulletin board containing information designed for them, including information on labor market trends, descriptions of job-seekers, and other program information useful to businesses.

Local One-Stop centers often used a variety of additional methods during the first year of One-Stop implementation to engage employer representatives in discussions about their service needs and interests. Often employers were invited to attend "open houses" at the new One-Stop centers to receive a detailed orientation to the services available at the center. These occasions were also used as an opportunity to solicit employer input on how to reshape employer services, while facility and service plans were still in relatively "fluid" stages of development. For example, the Lucas and Wood County (Ohio) One-Stop System, in conjunction with its administrative entity, the Toledo Area Private Industry Council, held a community-wide forum for employers and individual customers on how to improve One-Stop system services. The local Wood County Chamber of Commerce also sponsors "employer after hours" sessions periodically to continue the dialogue about improving Wood County's One-Stop services for employers.

Some One-Stop centers have arranged to obtain employer feedback on a regular basis by convening an ongoing Employer Advisory Committee. For example, at the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center, the *Employer Advisory Committee*, which meets on a quarterly basis, provides a structured forum for employer input and feedback. As a result of the employer needs expressed by members of this advisory committee, the Center has undertaken several new activities, including sponsoring employer seminars on topics of significant interest (e.g., the current labor shortage and workforce diversity) and acting as a liaison between businesses and schools to identify individuals interested in apprenticeship positions.

As part of the re-engineering of One-Stop employer services, a number of case study sites were also interested in reaching out beyond their current customer base to recruit additional employers not currently using the public workforce development system. They wanted first to identify the different needs of these employers, then to develop services that would satisfy their requirements. Employers identified as unaccustomed to using the public labor exchange system were characterized as typically small- or medium-sized, technology-based, and either in need of skilled technicians and middle managers or using a high proportion of part-time or temporary employees.

Several sites indicated that they had taken a proactive approach in contacting new employers to learn about their hiring and workforce development requirements. For example, at the New London *Connecticut Works* Career Center, staff reach out to employers on an individual basis. Instead of waiting for employers to come to the center, center staff regularly read the business section of local newspapers and actively search out new employers. The staff in Connecticut's Business Services Units also assign case managers to large regional employers to ascertain their needs and provide individualized services. Several sites have not only established individual customer service representatives for larger firms, but have also encouraged employer service staff to spend more time visiting individual employers so that they can become more familiar with the detailed operations and hiring needs of specific employers.

In marketing staff-related services to a broader pool of local employers, a number of sites have also approached the growing number of private labor market intermediaries—including "head-hunter" firms, outplacement firms, and firms leasing temporary or permanent contract workers—as important potential One-Stop employer customers, especially for automated information services on potential job applicants. (However, these firms also compete with One-Stop centers in providing labor-exchange services to individual employers.)

### Ensuring that One-Stop Career Center Staff are Prepared to Offer Employer-Friendly Services

A major barrier for One-Stop systems to overcome is the common employer perception that public workforce development services are mired in paperwork and bureaucracy and that employer services staff do not care about meeting employers' needs in a timely and efficient way. To change this perception, a number of the One-Stop centers visited for this study were trying to create a "work culture" that emphasizes the importance of customer service and customer satisfaction for both job-seeker and employer services. For example, in Connecticut, state trainers have improved One-Stop customer services by holding multiple rounds of training on three basic customer service skills: (1) telephone skills; (2) basic communication skills, including active listening and problem solving; and (3) skills specifically related to One-Stop services. A state training goal is to encourage "creativity" among local office staff.

Another way that One-Stop centers have improved their capacity to provide "business-friendly" services is to involve One-Stop agency partners experienced in providing individualized services to employers. There are many examples of this strategy among the case study sites. In the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center, the participation of the local economic development corporation as a key One-Stop partner clearly enhanced the center's legitimacy and credibility with area employers. The center is carefully cultivating its image within the business community as a place that employers can go to get their needs met. In the Columbia (Maryland) Employment and Training Center, strong referral and service-coordination linkages with the local economic development agency and the community college's customized training department improved the capacity of the One-Stop center to address employers' needs for more intensive services. These off-site partners offered a wide range of employer services, including business planning, business counseling, employer seminars, customized training, and relocation information and assistance. In Connecticut, the state has arranged for staff from the Department of Economic and Community Development to be outstationed within the business services units in Connecticut's career centers to increase the economic development expertise of business services unit staff.

In addition, a number of centers hired individuals with private sector experience to fill key positions. In many cases, the objective of these staffing decisions was to make it clear that employer services staff understood employer requirements and were motivated to make employers feel like valued customers. For example, most of the ten employer services staff at the FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield Massachusetts were selected because of their experience in the private sector or working with employers. Several other states and case study sites recruited key individuals with private sector management experience to lead One-Stop state and local transformation efforts.

### Ensuring that One-Stop Facilities are Attractive and Business-Like in Appearance

Case study sites found that making the One-Stop facility inviting and professional-looking was an important asset in attracting employers as customers. Some One-Stops have reported that center improvements alone seem to have encouraged employer customers to use the center; at these sites, staff were aware that the "dilapidated" condition of the old facility had put off potential employer customers. Particularly attractive to business representatives are centers with ample space for interviewing and screening new hire candidates, ample parking space, and prominently displayed signs advertising the location of the center.

As a physical reflection of the fact that both job-seekers and employers are core customers, the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center has two main entrances—one for employers and one for individual customers. At the business services entrance, reception services are provided by an employee of the Economic Development Corporation. The entrance for individual customers is staffed by a Job Service employee. Neither entrance looks like the "back" of the building. This decision was based on the desire to make each type of customer feel comfortable and perceive that the Center was designed "for them."

Staff at some centers also commented that refurbished One-Stop facilities succeeded in attracting more high-skilled job seekers, which helped these centers refer a wider range of job seekers to employers looking for experienced or highly-trained workers.

### GOAL 2. PROVIDING SIMPLIFIED ACCESS TO AN INTEGRATED MENU OF EMPLOYER SERVICES

Prior to the One-Stop initiative, employers often complained that the services offered by public workforce development agencies were uncoordinated and unresponsive, resulting in duplication and wastefulness. According to one respondent: "...too often you could never get anyone to answer your phone calls, but, on the other hand, you were bombarded with requests for employment and information by a number of organizations and agencies—often different offices or staff from the same agency."

Case study sites, aware of such employer complaints, determined that it was important to create a simplified and coordinated system by which employers could access the services or information they needed. The system had to provide employers with a unified way to list job openings and get job referrals and a single place to go to get information critical to the success or expansion of their businesses. To create such a system, case study sites developed three basic goals: (1) develop a unified One-Stop plan for the delivery of services to the business community, (2) coordinate the service delivery roles of the various One-Stop partners, and (3) develop a unified marketing approach to inform employers about the services available to them through the One-Stop system.

### Planning a Unified Employer Service Approach

Most case study sites formed inter-agency work groups to plan a unified approach for the design and delivery of services to businesses. These committees were typically made up of representatives of key One-Stop partner agencies (e.g., JTPA, ES, UI, welfare-to-work, vocational rehabilitation, community colleges) and included participation by business associations and interested local employers.

Inter-agency teams charged with planning One-Stop employer services were sometimes established at the state level. More often, however, they were formed at the regional, local, or career-center level, so that they could be responsive to the concerns of the local employer community.

Several states designed and coordinated employer services at the regional level, so that regional employer service specialists could support the delivery of a well-developed menu of employer services across all local One-Stop centers within the region. For example, in the Gulf Coast Region of Texas, employer services specialists working out of the ES regional office in Houston are available to help the staff at the Lake Jackson Career Center design and market enhanced training services to local employers, particularly customized recruitment and training services. Similarly, in Connecticut, "business services units" have been established in all nine regions of the state since 1992. These regional units—staffed by individuals from the state agency responsible for overseeing JTPA, ES, and UI services—have forged close alliances with the state agency responsible for economic and community development and the local boards responsible for overseeing JTPA services. Through their inter-agency alliances, business services units hope to become regional brokers of One-Stop services for businesses—offering a range of services directly as well as facilitating employer linkages with other relevant agencies and organizations.

In many cases, local inter-agency teams were developed to plan the design and delivery of an integrated menu of employer services, particularly in local sites where a number of different agencies were co-located within One-Stop centers. For example, an inter-agency job development team was established in Baltimore, Maryland, to clarify how local partners within the Baltimore Career Center Network would coordinate their job development contacts with employers. At the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center, an "Integrated Services to Employers Team" comprising representatives from nine local partner agencies was charged with designing a local One-Stop menu of services for employers.

In some sites, planning for unified employer services under the One-Stop initiative was closely linked to efforts to coordinate employer outreach and involvement of private industry in the other two national workforce development initiatives—the school-to-work and welfare-to-work initiatives. Particularly in local economies with tight labor markets and labor shortages, One-Stop partners often found it to their advantage to take a "big picture" approach to workforce preparation and to encourage employer involvement in the design and delivery of services to enhance the skills of future labor market entrants. In this economic context, enhancing the skills of future job seekers was viewed as a high priority by employers; teaching employers how to make effective use of workers drawn from an applicant pool made up of a large number of new labor market entrants and welfare recipients was viewed as a high priority by public sector planners.

Career center staff often tried to build bridges between efforts to prepare youth and welfare recipients for work and efforts to help employers find and train qualified workers. Employer services staff in a number of career centers, including the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center, considered it an important part of their role to help employers understand how they could support the entry of inexperienced and unskilled individuals into the future American workforce by improving the workforce preparation programs available to youth. In Iowa, for example, planning for integrated employer services under the One-Stop initiative was closely intertwined with planning and delivering employment-related services to individual welfare recipients under welfare reform.

In Lawrenceburg, Indiana, where the labor market is tight and employers have difficulty finding qualified workers, it was employers themselves who encouraged the One-Stop center to establish closer linkages with the school-to-work program as a way to increase the pool of job applicants available to employers. Specific service linkages between One-Stop and the schools in this rural community include plans for students to use the career and labor market information resources available in One-Stop centers and plans for One-Stop staff to participate in developing and offering job search workshops targeted to high school seniors.

### Coordinating the Delivery of Employer Services

Building on the efforts of the inter-agency planning teams, a number of One-Stop career centers developed a consolidated menu of employer services. However, not all case study sites achieved full integration of the One-Stop services provided to local employers. For example, in Columbia, Maryland, the four primary One-Stop partner agencies—JTPA, ES/UI, the local community college and the local economic development authority—all continued to offer distinct recruitment and outplacement services to employers. Nevertheless, even sites that have stopped short of full integration of employer services have attempted to coordinate employer services by sharing information across the partner agencies about the services available from each partner and the employers contacted by each. Most sites are attempting to move toward a more integrated design for delivering employer services over time, using several different service delivery approaches.

In some sites, the lead One-Stop agency attempted to coordinate employer services using a broker model, by providing information about the employer services provided by all One-Stop partners and facilitating employer referrals among these partners. For example, in Columbia, Maryland, JTPA and ES/UI staff located at the One-Stop career center attempted to broker the diverse services for employers offered by all four key One-Stop partners by increasing employer awareness of the available services and facilitating cross-agency referrals. In particular, One-Stop career center staff informally coordinated agency contacts with local employers and worked to increase employer awareness of the enhanced business services available from the business resource center operated at a separate location by the local economic development authority and from the continuing education center of the local community college[2].

To coordinate employer services, One-Stop partners often developed ways to share information about employers such as the history of employer contacts made by various One-Stop partners, and whether a firm already had a "customer service representative" or designated liaison assigned by one of the partners. Shared data bases were used to coordinate employer contacts and prevent duplication of effort in the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center and the Minnesota Career Center in Anoka County. As described in the next section, the development of a shared database with information on the detailed hiring requirements for all active employer job listings also proved to be a very effective mechanism that enabled One-

---

[2] Enhanced business services available from the employer resource center included business planning, business counseling, employer seminars, and relocation information and assistance.

Stop partners in several sites to improve the timeliness and efficiency of applicant referrals.

In other sites coordinated delivery of employer services among on-site One-Stop partners was achieved by assigning specialized service delivery roles to different partner agencies, to take advantage of the specialized skills of each agency's staff. For example, in Minnesota—by state fiat—the state Employment Service was designated as the agency responsible for maintaining job listings and providing labor-exchange services for all One-Stop partner agencies. Other local partner roles are negotiated at the local level to take advantage of "what each agency does best." In the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center, employer service functions are shared among (1) the Job Service and technical college placement service, which provide labor market information and labor exchange services; (2) the technical college's center for business and industry, which offers customized training and assistance with business expansion or relocation, and (3) the local economic development corporation, which helps link businesses to various forms of financial support.

Yet another approach for the coordinated delivery of employer services occurred in sites where One-Stop partners developed "shared" or consolidated employer services, in which staff from multiple agency partners participated. Employers tended to respond very positively to evidence of coordination and resource-sharing among public agencies. For example, at the Connecticut Works Career Center in New London, Connecticut, four different public One-Stop agencies and several community-based organizations and JTPA-service-provider organizations jointly sponsored a job fair. Staff attributed the high level of employer participation in this job fair at least partly to the high level of inter-agency cooperation achieved.

Additional examples of shared or consolidated employer services include the following:

- An integrated interagency case management team for employers, with one liaison or case manager assigned to each employer.
- The provision of integrated post-employment follow-on services to employers who hire One-Stop customers.
- The development of a One-Stop employer resource center that offers employers information about hiring laws and rules and best practices in recruiting, screening, and hiring new employees, and provides referral sources for management assistance and worker training.

- A unique partnership to use the state library system (in Connecticut) as a single point of access for making a range of automated information available to employers.

### Informing Employers about the Range of Services Available from One-Stop Partners

To be successful in coordinating the delivery of employer services, One-Stop partners found that they needed to make sure that employers were aware of the range of services available to them through the One-Stop system. To meet this need, One-Stop partners developed a variety of consolidated marketing, information, and referral mechanisms, including the following:

- A dial-up bulletin board service that provides automated description of employer services available from various One-Stop partners.
- A detailed face-to-face orientation for employers visiting One-Stop centers for the first time.
- A marketing videotape targeted to employers with information about all the services available to employers from the One-Stop system.
- A "calendar of events" oriented to employers on the state or local One-Stop system's Web site.

## GOAL 3. LINKING EMPLOYERS TO HIGH-QUALITY INFORMATION RELATED TO THEIR NEEDS AND INTERESTS

Businesses need access to a wide range of information about other businesses, labor markets, workforce characteristics, and local communities in order to make sound decisions about initial business formation, the location of business facilities, and what strategies to use for promoting business growth and expansion. This information has traditionally been provided by state workforce development agencies in the form of periodic published reports and statistical abstracts. Employers have criticized published data for being out-of-date by the time it becomes available, as well as for not being sensitive enough to regional and local variations within a state.

Improved technology for collecting, retrieving, and sharing information has made it possible for One-Stop systems to redesign the ways that information is provided to local businesses. Overall, these changes are intended to

- Be responsive to employers' expressed information needs and interests.
- Coordinate and unify the design and delivery of high quality information relevant to business needs.

- Improve the timeliness and accuracy of the information, and allow employers to extract information at the level of aggregation relevant to their needs (e.g., state, locality, or census tract).
- Expand the range of types of information available to employers through One-Stop centers.

In this section, we describe the different approaches used by the case study sites to provide employers with high-quality information on (1) labor markets, (2) education and training resources, (3) government regulations and programs, and (4) business management issues and assistance. In most sites, information is available through several different modes, including automated self-service options and staffed service delivery, to give employers a choice about the way they receive the information. Exhibit 10-1 describes how several case study sites provided high quality information to employers.

### Providing Labor Market Information

Accurate labor market information is essential for business planning and forecasting. In some sites, the state still prepares and mails periodic labor market reports to employers. Increasingly, however, labor market information is also being offered through a variety of more flexible formats, including user-friendly electronic databases from which employers can retrieve the particular information they want.

To make core One-Stop information services readily available to employers, most of the case study sites have developed dial-up electronic bulletin boards or Internet Web sites that permit employers to view and retrieve a wide range of information on occupation and industry trends, employment levels, characteristics of job seekers, and features of local communities. For example, Texas has developed an automated database called SOCRATES that can provide detailed labor market information to a variety of users, including employers. The state of Ohio has plans to establish an electronic bulletin board to provide employers with integrated information on current and projected labor market demands. To improve the labor exchange process, Ohio also plans to provide an analysis of specific skills demanded and supplied in different labor markets.

Beyond the self-service labor market information services developed for employer use, a number of One-Stop systems have put considerable energy into designing

## Exhibit 10-1
## Examples of Providing Employers with High-Quality Information

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | The Business Service Units within One-Stop career centers offer workplace consultation services to employers to help them understand issues related to total quality and performance competitiveness, and public laws and regulations related to their responsibilities as employers.<br>The Department of Higher Education has a toll-free information number that provides information on career and education opportunities throughout the state. |
| Maryland | The state has designed a special electronic bulletin board for employer access that includes labor force data, information on current job seekers, and other information specifically designed for use by employers. |
| Minnesota | Using its One-Stop implementation grant funds, Minnesota hired six regional labor market analysts whose job it is to ensure that centers are well-stocked with labor market information. These analysts are also available to support local office staff in interpreting labor market trends and preparing special analyses for employers. They also make presentations to business groups about local labor market conditions. |

additional information supports for the business community. Services developed across the case study sites include the following:

- Seminars for employers on local labor market trends and strategies for success.
- The availability of "labor market analysts" who provide individualized consultations on labor market conditions for individuals or groups of business representatives.
- The availability of detailed reports on the education and demographics of residents in specific local areas, designed for use by businesses considering relocating to or expanding into the area.

**Providing Information about Training and Education Resources**

Because employers are increasingly concerned about how to enhance the basic and occupational skills of their workers over time, information about education and training resources has become increasingly important to them. As described in the chapter on services for job-seekers, many One-Stop centers have been working to develop resource libraries and automated information systems with detailed listings of education and training providers. These systems include information about the skills covered in each program, and—as part of the development of Consumer Report Cards—information on the placements obtained by graduates of various training programs.

To supplement these basic resource listings, One-Stop systems are offering employers more detailed information about USDOL-sponsored apprenticeship programs, public and private providers of training for incumbent workers, and funding sources for training. This information is available in the form of written materials, as well as through consultations with program staff about customized training services available from local technical schools and community colleges. Employers can use this information to find out about the fees charged for these services, as well as how to obtain training subsidies targeted to "at risk" or expanding firms through government-funded programs. One-Stop centers in Minnesota, for example, provide employers with information about these programs as technical assistance when they are applying for funding. Similarly, in Texas, employers are provided with information about and assistance in applying for the "Smart Jobs" program, which offers state funding for workforce training for "at risk" employers.

### Providing Information about Government Regulations and Programs

Another of the criticisms that employers have about the public sector is that government regulations and paperwork are too complex and the multiplicity of programs is too confusing. In response, several of the case study sites have attempted to provide employers with a centralized source of information about government regulations and programs, as well as support in dealing with them. The objectives of these services are to reduce the burden of government-required paperwork for employers and to minimize the staff time spent dealing with rules infractions, penalties, and appeals.

Through planned "employer resource centers," employers will have access to information on such government laws and regulations as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the requirement for early employer notification of plans for large-scale layoffs, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) requirements, Unemployment Insurance compensation and related regulations, and tax credits for hiring members of targeted groups. Some One-Stop systems located "employer resource centers" at the same sites as One-Stop job-seeker services. In other One-Stop systems, employer resource centers were located off-site in a separate center specializing in business services.

In most sites, information on compliance with governmental regulations was provided through consultation with center staff. However, in some sites, information was also available in self-service format, either through computer access at the career center or via remote access from the employer's own worksite. Maryland plans to have a range of information available to employers via remote access, including information on WARN, ADA, and other employment-related legislation. In Minnesota, employer "libraries" are required to provide detailed information on a wide range of employment-related programs and regulations. Other One-Stop partners and programs, such as Vocational Rehabilitation and Veterans' Employment Services, are also expected to provide information on their programs for inclusion in the employer libraries.

### Providing Information about Business Management Topics

A final type of information that many One-Stop centers began to offer to employer customers—drawing on the expertise of economic and business development partners—was information related to business start-up and business management. In some One-Stop centers, employer seminars or information sessions were developed to respond to particular management-related concerns expressed by local businesses. For example, the FutureWorks Career Center in Springfield Massachusetts provides seminars on a variety of workforce issues requested by employers. The Wood County (Ohio) Employment Resource Center planned to poll employers on their interest in participating in workshops on such topics as violence in the workplace and workforce diversity.

In other One-Stop centers, employer seminars or information services focus on business startup and quality management. The Arlington (Texas) Career Center provides customers with information on small business start-up. Business service units within Connecticut's One-Stop centers offer consultations to employers seeking information regarding performance competitiveness and total quality management.

### GOAL 4. IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LABOR EXCHANGE SERVICES TO BETTER MEET EMPLOYER HIRING NEEDS

A number of different One-Stop partner agencies have offered labor exchange services to employers in the past. The state Employment Service agencies have been the primary providers of such services, but many additional agencies (e.g., JTPA service providers, educational institutions, welfare-to-work providers, and programs serving disabled individuals) have also offered employers labor exchange services. These services have included the posting of job listings, recruitment and screening of applicants for posted jobs, job matching to link job applicants to available work opportunities, and job development activities designed to make employers aware of the availability of qualified workers. As described previously, employers have criticized such services because of the duplication of employer contacts across agencies, the lack of timeliness in referring applicants, and the absence of appropriate skills among the referred applicants.

The One-Stop systems and centers included in this study have made a number of changes to their core labor-exchange services in response to these criticisms. Key strategies used in the case study sites included the following: (1) improving procedures used to list jobs and recruit interested applicants, (2) clarifying descriptions of jobs and required skills, and (3) improving the tools for matching job seekers to employers.

**Improving Job Listing and Applicant Recruitment Procedures**

Developments in information technology have made it possible to create improved job-listing systems that are more sophisticated and easier for customers to use and that can be shared among local One-Stop partners and across geographic units. With the advent of computer technology and inter-connectivity, job listings collected by one One-Stop partner or at one location can be easily shared throughout the state or local One-Stop system as well as nationwide. Although state job information systems are at different stages of development, all states now provide information about state employment opportunities to America's Job Bank (AJB), and most have the capability to offer their own customers on-site access to information about jobs throughout the state and across the nation.

As described in the chapter on job-seeker services, automated job listing services are a nearly universal core service at all One-Stop centers. From the employer perspective, the use of automated databases to disseminate job announcements greatly increases the effectiveness of listing a job with a public agency, since, in most sites, listing a job with a single One-Stop partner now means that the listing will be shared among all local partners as well as nationwide. In some sites, public agency staff continue to screen interested applicants before referring them to employers. However, in an increasing number of sites, employers are being encouraged to post "unsuppressed" job orders that include the employer's identity in the public listing and instruct interested applicants to apply directly to the employer.

Thus, under One-Stop systems, employers can seek a much greater range of types of workers through the public labor exchange services, and they have more choices about how involved they want to be in applicant screening and selection. Although not all employers are comfortable with using unsuppressed job orders—because they fear being deluged with large numbers of inappropriate applicants—some employers have found that unsuppressed job orders result in a higher rate of success in filling positions. These employers report a larger applicant stream and a quicker response to job announcements compared to the use of suppressed listings (in which the employers depended on program staff to screen and refer specific job seekers). To deal with the increased applicant flow generated by automated listings, many of these employers are developing more sophisticated in-house applicant screening and selection procedures or purchasing help with the early stages of applicant screening from public or private labor market intermediaries.

One-Stop systems generally allow employers to select the method of posting job listings they are most comfortable with. Where the technology is in place to allow employers to list their own job orders, a "self-service" option is available. These One-Stop centers invite or encourage employers to post their own job listings via dial-up bulletin boards (in Ohio), faxed-in job listings (in Indiana), or direct Internet access. In many sites, however, the self-service option is not available or not encouraged, and employers still depend on One-Stop staff to take job orders by telephone.

The advantage of making the job listing process a self-service function is that it frees up staff to provide other services to employers and job seekers and gives employers greater control over the recruitment function. However, retaining job posting as a staffed function increases the opportunity for One-Stop center staff to (1) develop a personalized relationship with an individual company's human resources staff, (2) become familiar with the firm's hiring needs and counsel them on writing effective and accurate job descriptions, and (3) assess the firm's interest in receiving additional One-Stop services.

**Clarifying Job Descriptions and Skill Requirements**

As another way of improving their labor-exchange function, a number of One-Stop systems offered to help employers do a better job of specifying the skills and qualities that they want and need in job seekers. In contrast to the technology-based improvements to the job listing process described above, improving the effectiveness of job descriptions and skills statements usually requires individualized attention from a One-Stop employer service representative.

One strategy for improving the accuracy and clarity of job descriptions is initiating a new skills-based system to replace outdated industry and occupation codes. This is being done at the national level through the development of O*NET. However, even before changing to a whole new system of describing jobs, a number of One-Stop centers have developed procedures to help employers identify and describe the essential skills that job seekers must possess to be successful in a given position. For example, staff at the Minnesota Career Center in Anoka County have found that asking employers more questions about the skills required for a particular job increases the likelihood of referring appropriate applicants. Similarly, other sites have encouraged employer service representatives to visit the job-site to get a clear understanding of the business and the nature of the work performed by employees.

A number of One-Stop centers are also offering to help moderate-sized and large employers clarify their hiring needs by conducting more formal functional assessments of jobs. Among the services offered are job/task analyses performed at the employer's job site, which are intended to identify the skills necessary for successful job performance. In some case study sites, these services are being offered free of charge as part of the menu of core services available to all employers. In other sites, formal functional analyses of job performance are offered on a fee-for-service basis.[3]

**Improving the Tools for Matching Job Seekers to Employers**

Matching an applicant's skills to those an employer requires for a particular position is often difficult. To reduce the number of "mismatches," some sites are developing sophisticated job matching software. Other sites are helping interested employers take over the task of screening and selecting new hires from the pool of available workers by giving employers direct access to "talent banks"—searchable databases with information about current job seekers.

Some states have designed sophisticated job matching systems to assist local staff in providing effective labor exchange services to employers. Minnesota SkillsNet and Ohio JobNet are examples of statewide automated job information systems that can help One-Stop staff match the characteristics of current job seekers to the characteristics being sought by employers through current job listings. To make these systems work, local sites must collect and record accurate information about job seekers using characteristics and measures that are compatible with those used by employers in their job orders. For example, in the Anoka County (Minnesota) Career Center, a client assessment database shared by the center and vocational and technical colleges helps provide information on job seekers as inputs to the matching process.

Job-matching systems require a fairly high degree of staff involvement. Local centers that emphasize job-matching systems have made a commitment to assisting employers individually with their labor exchange needs.

In contrast, some states have decided to de-emphasize the job matching responsibilities of public sector staff. For example, instead of performing any automated job matching, the state of Wisconsin now depends on job seekers to select employer job listings for which they are qualified and market themselves directly to employers.

---

[3] One proprietary system used in several sites to analyze job tasks and create a required applicant profile prior to screening job applicants is Work Keys, a system developed by American College Testing (now ACT, Inc.) in Iowa City.

In a number of other states and local sites, One-Stop systems are encouraging employers to play a more active role in screening applicants. Under the "Talent Bank" initiative, employers are offered direct access to automated listings describing job seekers, enabling them to do their own direct review, screening, and selection. This initiative, piloted in five states and promoted for implementation nationally by USDOL, depends on the ability of employers' own hiring representatives to use technology to scan information about the individuals in the applicant pool. Access to an unscreened pool of applicant resumes can be a powerful tool in the hands of trained human resource professionals with software designed to search and sort for desired characteristics. It is not yet clear, however, whether this technology will be embraced by employers, or whether they will want public employer service representatives to continue doing the hands-on work of screening and matching job applicants prior to referral.

As described in the next section, most case study sites have moved beyond the improvement of labor exchange services to concern themselves with expanding their range of enhanced services as a part of their strategy for providing improved services to employers in all areas of workforce development.

### GOAL 5. OFFERING ENHANCED EMPLOYER SERVICES

Defining employers as core customers of the public workforce development system, and involving economic development agencies, community and technical colleges, and business-oriented groups as active members of One-Stop partnerships has led to plans for establishing a number of enhanced services for employer customers. In most cases, the enhanced services are activities that one or more agency partners are already offering to employers. Under One-Stop, state and local partners are beginning to organize these services into integrated systems.

At the time of the evaluation site visits, most of the case study sites were still in the early stages of developing, systematizing, and deciding how to finance enhanced services for employers. Exhibit 10-2 describes the enhanced services under

## Exhibit 10-2
## Examples of Enhanced Employer Services

| | |
|---|---|
| Connecticut | The Business Service Unit in the New London Career Center offers assessment and screening services to employers who are undertaking large-scale hiring efforts.<br>The center also helps employers plan improvements in their manufacturing technology and plan and provide customized training for current workers. |
| Indiana | Enhanced services offered to employers by staff at the Eastside Indianapolis Workforce Development Center include assistance in meeting affirmative action requirements, customized analysis of labor market information for employers seeking to relocate to the area, and job/task analyses for employers interested in planning customized training for their employees. |
| Iowa | At the Des Moines Workforce Development Center, the ES agency, the economic development group of the area community college, and the chamber of commerce are developing a range of fee-for-service options for employers, including recruitment and screening for large-scale hiring efforts, and the use of the Work Keys assessment system to screen potential new hires.<br>Management assistance offered to employers includes a train-the-trainer program for company supervisors. |
| Texas | The Arlington Career Center links employers to entrepreneurial and small business start-up training programs offered by a number of local agencies and organizations. |
| Wisconsin | At the Waukesha County Workforce Development Center, various partner agencies offer customized training and consulting services, including training on total quality management techniques; assistance in obtaining economic development financing and business loans; and business needs analysis. |

development in several case study sites. Across the case study sites, these services are of three general types: (1) assessment of the skills of a firm's incumbent workers combined with help in designing and delivering training to enhance these skills; (2) intensive customized recruitment and screening services for large-scale hiring efforts; and (3) management assistance and support for helping firms start up, remain financially viable, and expand. Most case study sites plan to charge user fees for enhanced employer services as a way to generate revenues to support the costs of providing the services. However, in many local areas, some public funding supports are available to firms that meet particular eligibility qualifications; such firms may be at risk of downsizing or have the potential to bring many new jobs into the community.

### Services to Assess and Train Incumbent Workers

As described earlier, employers are facing an increasing need to support ongoing training of existing workers, to redress basic educational deficits, and to provide skills enhancements. Both public and private sector education and training providers have developed specialized fee-based services to address these needs.

Through One-Stop core services, employers are informed about the resources available to them from public workforce development agencies in planning and providing training for incumbent workers. For example, in the Waukesha County (Wisconsin) Workforce Development Center, employers are informed that the technical college—an active partner in the One-Stop center—has a long history of offering on-site or off-site customized training to incumbent workers, including training on total quality management tools and techniques. To make these services more affordable to small- and moderate-sized employers, the technical college was planning to develop some off-site "generic" TQM training sessions to which firms could send employees. In the Des Moines metropolitan area, employer customers are informed about the Economic Development Group housed within the local community college that offers subsidized employee retraining services to expanding and relocating businesses, through a state-funded "New Jobs" incentive program.

### Customized Recruitment and Screening Services for Large-Scale Hiring Efforts

A number of the case study sites were developing customized assessment and screening services for employers who were undertaking large-scale hiring efforts and wanted to out-source the early stages of the hiring process. For firms designated as economic development targets, these services might be provided at no cost, as explained above. For other firms, centers offered customized hiring assistance on a fee-for-service basis.

### Management Assistance and Training

In some case study sites, One-Stop staff are available to assist major employers with meeting their ongoing management needs by providing business planning data and customized analysis of labor market information, assisting firms in recruiting for specialized positions, and consulting on issues related to government regulations and the hiring process. As explained above, these services might be provided free of charge to firms that are targeted as having important economic development potential (e.g., a firm considering locating a new manufacturing facility in the local community) and offered on a fee-for-service basis to additional firms.

A planned Employer Resource Center within the Des Moines Workforce Development Center will inform employers about the availability of management assistance. The resource center will offer employers information about all aspects of the hiring process, including information about hiring laws and rules, information about "best practices" in recruiting, screening, and hiring new employers, and referral to technical assistance and training resources. The center will be funded with Wagner Peyser dollars and will emphasize self-service information, with staff consultation available when needed. More detailed train-the-trainer workshops are also being planned, in cooperation with the local chamber of commerce, to teach management staff and front-line supervisors about effective skills for work supervisors.

## ANALYSIS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN DEVELOPING EMPLOYER SERVICES

Although all case study sites identified the task of redesigning employer services as essential to the ultimate success of their One-Stop initiatives, refining services for individual job-seekers often took precedence during the first year of One-Stop implementation. Consequently, while case study sites made good progress in planning improved employer services, implementation of these plans was often scheduled for the second or third implementation year.

Overall, a number of factors influenced the design and implementation of improved and enhanced employer services:

- Technology advances provided the opportunity for sites to introduce new and more sophisticated automated information products, including job and resume listings and job/applicant matching software. However, in some case study sites the technology infrastructure for supporting the improved labor exchange tools had not yet been completed at the local level.

- One-Stop agency partners often lacked experience providing comprehensive services to employers. While this did not deter case study sites from developing sound employer services and adopting effective strategies and mechanisms to serve employers, it required that planners carefully develop and analyze their plans and consult with other business-led entities before "rolling out" the employer services package.
- A number of One-Stop sites were reluctant to market redesigned and enhanced employer services until the re-engineered system was complete. Thus, employers were not always aware of the availability of new and improved services to address their hiring and other business needs and interests.

Despite the many challenges facing case study sites during the first year, progress in improving the effectiveness of One-Stop services and products offered to the employer community was made in a number of key areas. Not content to wait for the employer community come to them, One-Stop centers devised a number of strategies to reach out to the business community to encourage them to "give the new system a chance." Case study sites also understood the value of first impressions; they tried to ensure that the business community knew that the "look and feel" of the transformed One-Stop system and its unified menu of employer services was different from the previous way of doing business.

Case study sites took very seriously their charge to become customer-oriented. To understand the employer community well enough to be capable of meeting the needs expressed by employers, One-Stop agencies and partners actively sought the participation and advice of business-related organizations and institutions. They also developed diverse service delivery mechanisms that balanced self-service options with the opportunity for individualized consultations and assistance from business-friendly One-Stop staff.

- Most case study sites can count among their achievements one or more of the following:
  *The involvement of a broad range of business-oriented partners in planning for One-Stop employer services.* Almost all local case study sites had developed strong working relationships with economic and

community development agencies and departments, chambers of commerce, and community colleges' business services units, all of which have credibility with employers. These organizations became key players in analyzing employers' needs and developing new and improved services and products for employers.

- *The development of a range of services and delivery mechanisms that gave employers choices about what types of services to receive and how to receive them.* Most case study sites went beyond providing the core services often identified with the public labor exchange system. Expanded services included consultation and technical assistance on current workforce needs, assistance in developing training programs for incumbent workers, and providing training on small business start-up and business management and supervisory skills.
- *A simplification of employer access to key services.* Simplifying access to employer services required that sites change their objectives from program-based goals to the customer-driven goal of meeting the needs of local employers. To achieve this new goal, important modifications were made in almost all sites, including providing employers with "account representatives" to coordinate their different needs and to broker services and information on their behalf.

While case study sites made impressive progress during their first year in redesigning employer services and beginning to implement their plans, most sites planned to continue to implement their vision of transformed services to employers over time. Clearly, designing and implementing such a large undertaking was still a "work in progress" at the end of the first implementation year. Challenges that remain to be addressed include the following:

- The need to assess the demand for fee-based services and determine whether and how the public workforce development system can compete with private sector providers in these areas. Sites varied widely as to the employer services they provided and on what basis they were provided. Several sites indicated that they were still in the process of deciding which services to offer to employers for a fee and how to establish the fee structure.
- The need to develop a wider variety of employer services and products and market these products to a greater mix of employers. A number of employer customers commented that the One-Stop centers were still a "well-kept secret."
- The need to assess the effects of improved employer services on customer satisfaction and labor exchange outcomes. Although some case study sites have developed employer satisfaction systems to

measure initial impact on the employer community, and a few sites were developing "benchmarks" to measure the effectiveness of center strategies and services, most sites have not developed systematic methods to analyze the impact of improved and expanded employer services on the local business community.

- The need to convince employers to use One-Stop systems to meet the full range of their hiring needs. Previous sections of this chapter have referred to the perception among employers that the public labor exchange system offers only candidates with little or no work experience and a narrow range of skills. To meet the challenges of welfare reform without being stereotyped as dealing with economically disadvantaged workers and low-wage job opportunities alone, One-Stop partners have to build and maintain a reputation for providing effective services to employers seeking workers at all levels of experience, skill, and education.

# SECTION E
# CONCLUSION

# E. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

## INTRODUCTION

Across all nine states and fourteen local areas, the transformation of workforce development services from separate and discrete categorical programs into coherent seamless systems is occurring through an evolutionary process, rather than overnight. This incremental approach is not surprising, given the distinct identities, histories, and workplace cultures of the different workforce development agencies that have come together to form One-Stop partnerships.

During the early stages of One-Stop implementation, individual One-Stop partner agencies have become familiar with the programs and services offered by other local agencies and have made clear progress in building collaborative working relationships across all local One-Stop partners. Early One-Stop implementation efforts in most study sites have emphasized partnership formation, the development of shared physical facilities and shared decision-making procedures, and the development of integrated front-end customer services, such as intake, orientation, and preliminary eligibility assessment.

Although most states and local sites are still relatively early in the process of consolidating services for job-seeker and employer customers, the initial stages have already led to significant changes in the services available to employer and job-seeker customers. During these early stages of the One-Stop initiative, the greatest impacts on One-Stop customers in most sites have occurred as a result of the following:

(1) A new customer-oriented service philosophy that emphasizes meeting customer needs rather than following bureaucratic regulations.

(2) The development and refinement of self-access information tools for use by employers and individuals.

(3) A new emphasis on making services attractive to employers and coordinating employer services across programs and funding streams.

The importance of these changes should not be underestimated. Both employer and job-seeker customers who participated in focus groups as part of this evaluation were enthusiastic in describing One-Stop career centers as improvements over the previous uncoordinated system.

The federal One-Stop initiative identified four customer-oriented goals that should guide the development of local One-Stop systems: (1) universal access, (2) customer choice, (3) seamless services, and (4) accountability driven by attention to customer outcomes, including customer satisfaction. In this chapter we describe the progress that has been made in furthering these four overall goals and suggest how federal, state, and local policy makers could help solidify the progress already made and prepare for additional system improvements.

### UNIVERSAL ACCESS

As a result of the changing nature of employer hiring patterns and rapidly changing skills requirements in the global economy, it is expected that more and more Americans, including currently employed workers, will need help periodically to enhance their skills or transition to new jobs. Employers will also have to adjust to rapidly changing market conditions. One of the goals of the One-Stop career center system initiative is to address these trends by making cost-effective services available to individual One-Stop customers and employers based on their individual needs, rather than their eligibility for specific categorical programs.

To realize the goal of universal access to workforce development services for individual and employer customers, most One-Stop sites included in the evaluation have designed a three-tier "pyramid" of services. The first tier of services consists of self-access information services that can be provided at a reasonable cost to a large number of customers. The second tier of services includes staff-assisted individual or group services, such as brief workshops or individual counseling sessions. The third tier of services includes the most intensive services such as education, occupational skills training, and supportive services. Because of the high cost of these services, access to the third tier of services is usually limited to customers who qualify for assistance from specific categorical funding streams.

The case study sites have made services accessible to all customers by offering first-tier services and selected second-tier services to a broad customer base. This has been a challenging task, because most of the categorical workforce development funding streams are targeted to segmented "high risk" groups based on specific eligibility criteria such as low income, limited education, skills gaps, or other identified barriers to employment. As a result, Wagner-Peyser funds—which are not targeted to a specific segment—have played an important role in many sites as the "glue" that holds the rest of the One-Stop system together and makes it possible to offer One-Stop services to the general public. Specific approaches used by the case study sites to realize the One-Stop goal of universal access are described below.

### Providing Universal Core Services

One of the most significant accomplishments in meeting the goal of universal access has been the development of high-quality "self-access services" available to all One-Stop individual and employer customers in most evaluation sites. These services usually include automated information systems that offer user-friendly information about labor market conditions, careers, specific employers and job opportunities, and education and training resources. Most states have played an instrumental role in developing automated information products and developing the information infrastructure to deliver these services to One-Stop customers. In addition, many local sites have developed impressive customer resource rooms stocked with a variety of relevant print and multi-media information resources as well as equipment such as telephones, word processing equipment, and fax machines to support customer job search. Some local sites have also developed additional self-access products that allow customers to assess their skills and interests, learn about effective job search methods, or receive automated instruction in basic or occupational skills.

Self-access services expand and enrich the services available to the general public and have been well-received by a number of One-Stop customers, including individuals who have not previously used public employment services. However, many sites need to take additional steps to ensure that these services are useful to One-Stop customers. These steps include (1) making potential customers aware of the available services and convincing them to try them, (2) making sure that customers know how to make full use of the available information tools, (3) improving the capacity of One-Stop staff to assist customers in using these automated information tools to address particular service needs, and (4) continuing to improve these products so that they offer up-to-date information relevant to customers' information needs.

### Making It Possible for a Wide Variety of Customers to Access One-Stop Services

Additional approaches to making One-Stop services accessible to a wide variety of customers include extending the hours of center operation and making automated information services available to customers from a number of different locations.

A number of case study sites have extended the hours of center operations to accommodate employed workers and others who might find it difficult to visit One-Stop centers during normal business hours. Although some sites have found it difficult to establish staggered work schedules for center staff or develop procedures to ensure facility and customer security during extended operating hours, other sites have been able to establish extended hours of operation, including evening and/or weekend hours.

In addition, most case study sites make automated information services accessible from a number of different community locations, including One-Stop centers, libraries, schools, and shopping malls, as well as through remote access from home or business computers equipped with modems. The developments of user-friendly automated information products and remote-access technologies have made One-Stop services accessible to large groups of potential customers who have not previously used public workforce development services. The only potential drawback to remote-access services—as compared to providing these services in a staffed One-Stop resource room—is that customers cannot easily receive staff assistance if they have difficulty learning how to use the information products.

### Providing Enhanced Services to a Broad or Universal Customer Base

In most of the local One-Stop systems we visited, staff and customers alike emphasized that personal contacts with One-Stop staff and guided and group services were also extremely important in meeting the needs of many customers. However, in the absence of federal legislation providing consolidated funding for such services (e.g., through state workforce development block grants), most states and local sites have proceeded cautiously in creating opportunities for the general public to receive staffed or guided One-Stop services beyond the traditional services provided under UI or Job Services and receiving referrals to jobs posted by local employers.

Some sites have led the way by making a diverse menu of guided and group services available to all One-Stop customers. Other sites, however, have made staffed services available to the general public only on a "space available" basis. Fee-for-service arrangements are also under discussion in most sites as a way to make enhanced services—such as resume development, career counseling, or job search training—available to the general public. However, most sites have not yet tested the market demand among individual job-seekers for fee-based enhanced services.

More intensive education and training services are still largely provided only to customers of categorical programs targeted to particular groups. Only a few sites have developed general "skills development" units, whose staff are available to help all individual One-Stop customers explore financial aid opportunities and apply for education and training programs.

### CUSTOMER CHOICE

Another One-Stop goal is to give customers meaningful choices about the services they receive. This is in keeping with the philosophy of providing flexible services that are responsive to the individual needs of each customer rather than being determined by the categorical program for which the customer happens to qualify. Different case study sites have emphasized different aspects of customer choice in their One-Stop system designs.

#### Providing High-Quality Information to Guide Customer Choice

The case study sites have all expanded customer choice by providing high-quality user-friendly information about local labor markets, careers, employers, available jobs, and education and training opportunities. Generally, these information systems have not been developed as separate free-standing databases. Rather, the data are integrated so that customers can move back and forth across topic areas to identify career interests, review local employment opportunities in the selected career areas, identify the skills needed for employment in the targeted occupations, and identify alternative providers of needed skills training.

As noted previously, to realize the full potential of One-Stop information services to support informed customer choice, potential users of One-Stop information services have to be made aware of the existence of these services and have to be informed about how to use these tools effectively. In recognition of this fact, a number of the case study sites have developed plans to provide training both to One-Stop customers and to staff on how to use automated information systems and how to use labor market information to make individual career decisions and guide business development.

#### Offering Customers Choices among Different Service Modes and Workshops

Most One-Stop systems offer the general public a range of service options, including both self-access services and staffed services. Individual customers may be able to choose, for example, whether they want to learn about effective job search methods by completing an automated job-search tutorial available over the Internet or in a career center resource room; reading a book or pamphlet on job search techniques from the One-Stop center's resource room; attending a two-hour job-search "brush-up" class or a four-hour class on how to interview for a job, oriented to new job-seekers; or participating in a peer job-club at which job seekers share leads and give each other support.

Within a given One-Stop center, customers are generally given a number of choices among services, including self-access information services, group workshops, individual counseling sessions, and more intensive education and training supports. Information about the full range of available services is usually provided through an initial orientation. In most One-Stop centers, customers can move freely back and forth across service modes for which they qualify and can use several different service modes simultaneously.

Most of the case study sites also increased customer choice by offering a wide range of brief employment preparation workshops, rather than a single consolidated multi-week "employment preparation" course. Several sites offered a large number of different workshops, covering different aspects of career decision making, resume development, job search techniques, and skills needed for success on the job or job advancement. Customers were able to choose whether to attend individual sessions or entire workshop sequences.

### Offering Choices Among Career Center Locations or Sponsoring Agencies

Some case study sites decided to promote customer choice by encouraging different One-Stop centers within the same geographic service area to specialize in different services. In some cases, these centers were also operated by different service providers. It was not clear, however, whether most One-Stop customers were aware that they had a choice among centers, or, if aware of such a choice, whether they were willing to travel to a more distant career center to take advantage of additional services more appropriate to their individual needs.

## INTEGRATED SERVICES

The integration goals of the One-Stop career center initiative are twofold: to make workforce development services seamless from the customer perspective and to reduce duplication of effort among the multiple providers of publicly funded workforce development services. Initial efforts to increase service integration often caused organizational strains within and between One-Stop partner agencies, because they required substantial changes to the organizational cultures of participating agencies as well as transformations of the job tasks performed by individual staff. To avoid organizational trauma, many local One-Stop systems limited their initial service integration efforts to a few functions for which there were clear mutual benefits from integration among the partnering agencies.

During the initial stages of One-Stop implementation, all partners have benefited simply as a result of having a clearer understanding of the goals, services, and operational procedures of the different categorical programs operated by local workforce development partners. This initial improved staff awareness and understanding of the entire One-Stop "system" has usually led to improved coordination of customer referrals and increased system-level coordination or consolidation of administrative functions and service delivery arrangements. Different approaches to workforce development system integration pursued by the One-Stop sites included in this study are briefly summarized below.

### Coordinating Information, Referral, and Intake Services

In all sites, the One-Stop initiative has increased the familiarity of One-Stop staff with the resources available from local workforce development partners and has increased the communication among local partners about their shared goals and customers. Staff, in turn, have been able to help "de-mystify" the different categorical programs for One-Stop customers and help customers contact service providers that have services appropriate to their needs.

As a result of formal One-Stop partnerships, a number of states and local agencies have consolidated their front-end services of outreach, orientation, and intake. Through a consolidated initial intake process, customers in these sites receive preliminary eligibility screening for a wide range of employment and educational programs and are informed about a range of services for which they may qualify. The development of fully integrated front-end services, however, is an ambitious undertaking that is difficult to complete in the context of categorical block grants. One-Stop partners need to continue to prepare reports required by their particular funding streams on eligibility criteria, customers, services provided, outcomes, and expenditures—as defined by each categorical program.

### Integrating Employer Services

All case study sites identified the task of redesigning employer services as essential to the ultimate success of their One-Stop initiatives. During the first year of One-Stop implementation, One-Stop partners in most sites involved employers, business associations, and economic development agencies in efforts to analyze employers' needs and preferences. Improved employer services under development in most sites included core services—such as improved job and resume listing services and software to match applicants and jobs—and enhanced services—such as services to assess and train incumbent workers, assist employers with large-scale hiring efforts, and support firm development by providing management assistance and training. To simplify employer access to a unified menu of services, a number of sites introduced integrated systems of employer "account representatives" to coordinate and broker services for individual employer customers. However, designing and implementing improved employer services was still largely a "work in progress" at the end of the study period.

### Integrating Job-Seeker Services

Local sites varied substantially in the extent to which they have attempted to consolidate services to One-Stop job-seeker and other individual customers—beyond the first tier of self-access services available to all customers—and in the approaches they developed to further this goal. As described elsewhere in this report, efforts to integrate job-seeker services have ranged from coordination of services provided by separate staff from each categorical program to integrated staffing arrangements for delivering selected service functions such as assessment, career exploration, or job search assistance.

Whereas most local One-Stop partners are in agreement, at least in theory, about the benefits of developing integrated employer services, there is less agreement (both within and across sites) about whether further integration of job-seeker services will benefit customers. In a number of sites, policy makers guiding the One-Stop transformation appear to be poised at a critical decision point: whether to proceed with further integration of services for all customers or whether to continue to operate separate but coordinated categorical workforce development programs. Key concerns include (1) how to ensure that One-Stop service offerings remain responsive to the widely varying needs of One-Stop customers from various subgroups (e.g., dislocated workers, at-risk youth, high school drop-outs, older workers, veterans, individuals with disabilities, and individuals making the transition from welfare to work); (2) how to prepare local partnering agencies and service staff to take on new responsibilities in an integrated One-Stop career center system; and (3) how to prioritize the needs of different customers at a time when overall public investments in social programs are shrinking and overall customer needs remain high.

One-Stop partners in a number of the study sites have decided to continue efforts to increase service integration because they believe this approach will provide higher quality services to local employers and job-seekers, which, in turn, will better support local economic growth and development. In the absence of a clear federal legislative mandate for the development of integrated state workforce development systems, however, it will be difficult for all states to make the commitment to pursue the full integration of categorical workforce development systems.

### Making Coordinated Investments in One-Stop Infrastructure and Supportive Systems

One-Stop integration efforts have extended to developing an integrated information infrastructure and coordinating the overall One-Stop planning and implementation process. Federal One-Stop implementation grants have been an important catalyst for the creation of state and local interagency One-Stop policy groups and work teams to undertake coordinated efforts to develop appropriate One-Stop physical facilities, finance One-Stop services, market One-Stop systems to employer and job-seeker customers, develop shared information systems, and implement staff development efforts. For the most part, these interagency policy and task groups have functioned very smoothly during the implementation grant period.

However states that are about to "graduate" from the three-year One-Stop implementation process may find it difficult to continue integrated One-Stop system building without the structure imposed by an external goal-setting process, a formal implementation schedule, and funding that overcomes institutional and financial barriers to system integration. Prior to the end of the formal implementation grant period, states will need to give serious attention to transforming the project-based nature of the One-Stop initiative into permanent organizational and program changes, if they want to ensure that the integrated One-Stop systems they have created will survive the end of the federal implementation grant period.

### SYSTEM ACCOUNTABILITY DRIVEN BY CUSTOMER OUTCOMES AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

The final overall goal established as part of the One-Stop initiative is to create a workforce development system that is "outcome-driven," in the sense that it measures customer outcomes, including customer satisfaction, and uses information about customer outcomes to undertake continuous improvement efforts.

During the study period, agencies and programs participating in state and local One-Stop partnerships continued to be subject to the reporting requirements and performance expectations established for each of their individual categorical funding streams. The lack of consistency in these program-specific reporting and performance requirements has made it difficult to design integrated systems to measure outcomes across all One-Stop partners or to implement new One-Stop performance measurement systems.

Most study states made significant progress during the initial stages of One-Stop implementation in planning an overall menu of One-Stop performance measures for future implementation. They also began collecting information on customer satisfaction and other measures that could be used to assess One-Stop system-wide performance over time. At the local level, some One-Stop centers began to use information on customer outcomes and satisfaction to support system-wide improvement efforts, while others were waiting for additional leadership and guidance from the state or federal level. There is, as yet, no consensus about whether One-Stop performance measures should supplement, subsume, or replace the performance measures for individual categorical workforce development programs.

### FACTORS INFLUENCING ONE-STOP SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A number of factors have influenced the early One-Stop implementation experiences of the case study sites. Factors that appear to have facilitated the development of effective One-Stop partnerships and the achievement of system transformation goals include the following:

- A strong history of collaboration among local workforce development programs—such as JTPA and ES/UI or JTPA and welfare-to-work systems—prior to the One-Stop initiative.

- A state One-Stop design that provides clear guidelines for local One-Stop systems but also allows local One-Stop partners substantial discretion to tailor One-Stop systems to local needs.
- Continued active involvement over time by a broad range of state and local planning partners in ongoing planning and oversight of the evolving One-Stop system.
- The involvement of direct service staff from participating agencies in the planning of shared facilities and consolidated services over an extended planning period (e.g. 6 months to a year) prior to opening the One-Stop center.
- Formal planning linkages between the One-Stop initiative and school-to-work and welfare-to-work systems at both the state and local level.
- An attractive, accessible physical facility that supports both a flexible customer flow and frequent interaction among staff of partnering agencies.
- The ability of One-Stop staff from different agencies to exchange relevant information and communicate via electronic mail on a regular basis.
- Careful attention to the capacity building needs of One-Stop managers and local staff to help prepare them to deliver integrated customer services.

The development of integrated One-Stop systems is also occurring in the face of significant barriers in a number of sites. These barriers include the following:

- The absence of a federal legislative mandate for the development of integrated state workforce development systems. The fact that workforce development block grants were not approved by the 104th Congress removed a key source of federal policy support for the integration of One-Stop services by states. It also removed an expected source of financing for integrated services.
- The resulting continuation of federal categorical funding streams, each with its own mandated targeted population, eligibility criteria, reporting requirements, and performance standards.
- Concerns about how to ensure that individuals from groups with special needs will have access to the services they need. Each of the categorical programs has its dedicated constituency concerned about the needs of the targeted population group. For example, key constituencies are concerned about how veterans, individuals with disabilities, at-risk youth, welfare recipients, non-English speakers, and

other special groups will fare in a system that is not designed around special programs for each of these groups.

- Concerns about the job security of the workers in the various bureaucracies currently responsible for administering each of the categorical programs.
- Declining overall public investments in workforce development programs and services. A number of respondents indicated their concern that they were being asked to "do more with less." If overall resources continue to decline, even an integrated workforce development system will find it difficult to deliver high quality services to a diverse customer base.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The following actions by federal, state, and local policymakers would be particularly helpful in supporting efforts by local workforce development systems to further the One-Stop goals of universality, customer choice, integration, and accountability for customer outcomes.

1. Develop a number of different approaches that could be used by local One-Stop systems to finance the delivery of integrated One-Stop services.
    - Support the development of alternative cost-allocation practices.
    - Work to increase the flexibility of program regulations that require certain One-Stop staff to be "dedicated" to the service of only a single customer group, such as individuals with disabilities or veterans.
    - Identify additional funding sources to support the development and delivery of first tier (self-access) and second tier (guided or group) services to a broad range of One-Stop customers.
2. Work toward improved collaboration among workforce development agencies and programs at the federal and state level, including programs funded by the U.S. Department of Labor, the U.S. Department of Education, and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
    - Begin to develop consensus about standardized workforce development reporting and performance measures on an interagency basis at the federal level.
    - Encourage collaborative linkages between welfare-to-work, school-to-work, and One-Stop implementation efforts at all levels.

  - Address legislative and regulatory barriers to integrating service delivery across all workforce development programs, including particularly vocational rehabilitation and veterans employment services.

3. Support the development of interagency collaborative service approaches to meet the needs of individuals with "special needs," such as welfare recipients, individuals with disabilities, and veterans.

4. Plan for on-going investments to update and maintain over time the automated self-service information products and the information infrastructure that supports them.